

Calendar No. 483

86TH CONGRESS }
1st Session }

SENATE

{ REPORT
{ No. 486

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

JULY 8, 1959.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 7509]

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 7509) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made:

Amount of bill as passed House.....	\$1, 177, 177, 000
-------------------------------------	--------------------

Amount of increase by Senate (net).....	79, 659, 300
---	--------------

Amount of bill as reported to Senate.....	1, 256, 836, 300
---	------------------

Amount of estimates for 1960.....	1, 176, 677, 000
-----------------------------------	------------------

Amount of appropriations, 1959	1, 136, 503, 285
--------------------------------------	------------------

The bill as reported to the Senate—

Exceeds the estimates of 1960.....	80, 159, 300
------------------------------------	--------------

Exceeds the appropriation for 1959.....	120, 333, 015
---	---------------

TITLE I

CIVIL FUNCTIONS DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1959.....	\$7, 450, 000
Budget estimate, 1960.....	9, 000, 000
House allowance.....	9, 194, 000
Committee recommendation.....	9, 194, 000

The committee approved the amount allowed by the House. Public Law 85-644, approved August 14, 1958, authorized the furnishing of headstones for members of the Armed Forces whose remains were buried at sea or are otherwise not recoverable. This new requirement is the principal reason for the increase in the budget estimate over the current year.

The House allowed an additional \$194,000 over the budget estimate to provide for more adequate maintenance of Arlington National Cemetery, particularly for the rectification of sunken graves. The committee concurs in this action of the House.

The committee believes, however, that the conditions prevailing at Arlington are not unique. It desires that in connection with the preparation of the 1961 budget, representatives of the Memorial Branch of the Quartermaster Corps carefully review the maintenance standards at other national cemeteries, and be prepared to report to the committee on the conditions existing elsewhere.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The budget estimate for the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers considered by the House was \$863,180,000. The bill as passed by the House provided \$863,940,500. The House added 24 unbudgeted general investigation items and 44 unbudgeted construction and planning items. These new construction items were financed by (1) savings reported by the Corps of Engineers amounting to \$11,541,000; (2) reductions in budget estimates amounting to \$4,439,000; and (3) increasing the reduction for slippage and savings from \$30 million to \$43 million. The Corps of Engineers have requested restoration of items 2 and 3 amounting to \$17,439,000.

For a number of years it has been the practice to underfinance the approved program by about 5 percent to take into account savings and slippages. The bill as it came to the committee was underfinanced by an additional \$17,439,000, for which restoration was requested by the Corps of Engineers.

The committee recommends \$932,468,800. The committee recommendation is \$69,288,800 above the estimate and \$68,528,300 more than the House allowed.

The new construction starts allowed by the House will involve a future commitment of \$314,223,000. The additional new construction starts recommended by the Senate committee involve a future commitment of \$333,532,000. The bill as reported to the Senate therefore represents a future commitment of \$647,755,000. This amount is less than the amount recommended by the President for construction for fiscal year 1960.

The committee notes that 40 projects will be completed with the amount recommended in the budget. It is essential therefore that

some new starts be added each year. Since the future commitment in the recommended program is less than 1 year's construction at the going rate, it is apparent that the committee has been conservative in their recommendation.

The committee recommendations are discussed under the individual appropriation items.

COST ESTIMATES

The committee notes a marked improvement in the Corps of Engineers estimates. For the past few years the corps has reported a number of instances where projects can be completed with less than the budget estimate, and frequently the cost estimates have been reduced during the final stages of construction. On individual projects there are still material increases in the estimated cost over the original estimate submitted at the time construction was initiated. The overall increases in the cost of the projects currently under construction is well within the actual annual increase in the cost of construction. Even with respect to individual projects, where there are substantial variations from the estimate submitted at the time construction was initiated, it would appear that the corps' estimates are not out of line. Their estimates usually vary less than the range of the estimates of responsible bidders bidding on the projects. The corps estimates of necessity represent their best judgment of what responsible competitive contractors will bid on any particular project.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

For the past 4 years this committee has discussed the importance of water resource development in its reports in the hope of arousing widespread interest in an orderly program of development. Only in this way can the extravagance of crash programs be avoided in the immediate future.

The need for awakening public interest in this program has been accentuated previously by inadequate budget requests for going projects, which inevitably result in costly delays, and by the no-new-start policy of the Bureau of the Budget.

This year the situation is somewhat different. The budget itself generally provided reasonable amounts for the continuation of going projects. The House committee in its report included an excellent discussion of the fallacy of the no-new-starts policy, and that committee recommended, and the House approved, 44 unbudgeted construction and planning items for the Corps of Engineers. Of particular importance is the fact that this session, the Senate adopted a resolution setting up a select committee on water resource development, for the purpose of reviewing existing legislation and formulating a coordinated national program for the development of the water resources of the country.

In the light of these recent developments, it would appear unnecessary to discuss in detail the importance of the various phases of this program, other than to again stress the urgency of adequate appropriations for the development of these resources in keeping with the exploding population growth of the United States.

RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1959.....	\$10, 188, 500
Budget estimate, 1960.....	9, 000, 000
House allowance.....	9, 518, 400
Committee recommendation.....	11, 938, 200

The committee recommendation of \$11,938,200 represents a modest increase over the amount recommended by the committee last year for this purpose to take into account the pay raise increase voted by the Congress after the committee's recommendation of last year. The committee approved the House action with respect to general investigations, with the following exceptions: It has restored the budget estimates listed below which were denied by the House:

Lake Champlain Waterway.....	\$10, 000
Big Muddy River and Beaucoup Creek.....	30, 000
S. Res. 148.....	100, 000
Coordination studies.....	40, 000

POTOMAC RIVER REVIEW REPORT

The committee recommends \$400,000, the amount allowed by the House, which is \$100,000 below the budget estimate. In reducing the budget estimate, the House committee stated that it desired some information on possible features of the ultimate project and the amount of local contribution or reimbursement which could be expected if the river development is undertaken.

The Senate committee recognizes the urgency of solving the water supply and pollution abatement problems for the Washington metropolitan area and concurs in the views of the House concerning the desirability of obtaining information as to the possible features of the ultimate project and the extent of local cooperation. It will expect such information when the corps presents its request for fiscal year 1961. It has noted that the district engineer has discussed the subject of local cooperation for the water supply features of the project with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, and Fairfax County, and that all three agencies are aware of and accept the fact that local contributions for the water supply features will be required.

In view of the urgency of providing an adequate water supply for the area, and in recognition of the extent of the opposition to the construction of hydroelectric projects, the committee directs that the funds appropriated be used to finance the study of water supply and pollution abatement authorized by Senate Public Works Committee resolution adopted July 6, 1959, rather than for the comprehensive study previously authorized.

SENATE RESOLUTION 148

The committee has recommended the restoration of the \$100,000 requested in the budget estimate for the preparation of the additional data required by Senate Resolution 148, 85th Congress. The committee notes that as a result of further study and discussion, it has been determined that the cost of providing the information required by Senate Resolution 148 has been substantially reduced. The committee considers that the information required under that resolution is essential for the consideration of the legislative committees handling the public works program.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

The budget estimate for coordination studies by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior was deleted by the House committee during its consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill. The Senate committee restored the item. In conference the item was deleted. The following statement of the managers on the part of the House was included in the conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill:

The conferees are in agreement that funds for river basin studies should continue to be transferred from appropriations of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. However, the conferees recommend that the appropriations involved hereafter contain specific language indicating the amount to be transferred to the Fish and Wildlife Service. It is recognized that these agencies will require additional funds to finance these studies.

The committee has included funds in the amount of \$50,000 for this purpose and has recommended appropriate language in line with the views of the conferees on the Interior Department appropriation bill.

ALLOCATION OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The committee considers an active, well-balanced survey program to be the keystone of an orderly and sound water resource program.

As in the past, the committee prefers not to make specific allocations to individual investigations. It desires, however, to call to the attention of the Corps of Engineers the testimony presented to the committee with respect to the need for increased amounts for surveys contained in its tentative allocation of budget recommendations and expects that increased amounts will be applied to those surveys where feasible. In the allocation of the balance of the increase recommended it is desired that careful consideration be given to the needs of those areas for which testimony was presented to the committee.

General investigations

Item	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1960	House allowance	Senate committee recommendation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			
1. Examinations and surveys:			
(a) S. Res. 148.....			\$100,000
(b) Navigation studies.....	\$600,000	\$709,500	1,185,800
(c) Flood control studies.....	2,100,000	2,459,900	3,331,400
(d) Beach erosion cooperative studies.....	75,000	75,000	100,000
(e) Special studies:			
(1) San Francisco Bay survey.....	400,000	400,000	750,000
(2) Ohio River Basin review.....	400,000	400,000	500,000
(3) Great Lakes Harbor survey.....	260,000	260,000	367,000
(4) Coordination studies with other agencies.....	150,000	110,000	150,000
(5) Delaware River comprehensive survey.....	330,000	330,000	330,000
(6) Watershed Protection Act studies.....			
(7) Hurricane studies.....	950,000	950,000	950,000
(8) Hudson River (siltation) studies.....		114,000	114,000
(9) Potomac River review.....	500,000	400,000	400,000
(10) Colorado River, Tex.....	75,000	75,000	100,000
(11) Trinity River.....	200,000	200,000	300,000
(12) Great Lakes water levels.....			75,000
(13) Rampart Canyon, Alaska.....			100,000
Subtotal, examinations and surveys.....	6,040,000	6,483,400	8,853,200
Collection and study of basic data:			
(a) Stream gaging (U.S. Geological Survey).....	225,000	225,000	225,000
(b) Precipitation studies (U.S. Weather Bureau).....	330,000	330,000	330,000
(c) Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service).....			50,000
(d) International water studies.....	50,000	50,000	50,000
Subtotal collection and study of basic data.....	605,000	605,000	655,000
3. Research and development:			
(a) Beach erosion development studies.....	200,000	200,000	200,000
(b) Hydrologic studies.....	150,000	150,000	150,000
(c) Civil works investigations.....	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
(d) Mississippi Basin model:			
(1) Construction.....	700,000	700,000	700,000
(2) Mississippi River comprehensive study.....	105,000	105,000	105,000
Subtotal, research and development.....	2,355,000	2,355,000	2,355,000
4. Alaska pierhead lines survey.....			
5. Arkansas-Red River pollution.....		75,000	75,000
Total, general investigations.....	9,000,000	9,518,400	11,938,200

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriation, 1959.....	\$608, 246, 500
Budget estimate, 1960.....	660, 000, 000
House allowance.....	658, 800, 100
Committee recommendation.....	710, 034, 100

ECONOMICAL CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULES

In general, it is the opinion of the committee that the budget estimates and the amount allowed by the House, together with the transfer authority available to the Chief of Engineers, will provide adequate funds for projects under construction. In a few instances the committee has increased the amount allowed, but, by and large, has adhered to the budget estimates for work underway.

ADVANCED ENGINEERING AND DESIGN

The committee has provided additional funds for advanced planning in order to insure a steady flow of well-planned projects for consideration in future years. The committee has recommended \$11,990,000 for this purpose, which is \$2,614,000 above the House and \$2,890,000 above the budget estimate.

ALLOCATION OF SENATE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The allocation of the amount recommended by the committee for the individual projects is shown in the accompanying table.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1960

8

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1960

Construction, general, State and project (1)	Total estimated Federal cost (2)	Amount appropriated to date (3)	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1960		Amount allowed by House		Committee recommendation	
			Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
Alabama:								
(N) Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(N) Columbia lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia.....	\$13,600,000	\$898,000	\$1,000,000	-----	\$1,000,000	-----	\$1,000,000	-----
(N) Holt lock and dam.....	33,000,000	¹ 79,000	-----	-----	-----	\$150,000	-----	\$150,000
(N) Jackson lock and dam.....	21,000,000	8,112,000	8,150,000	-----	8,000,000	-----	8,000,000	-----
(P) Millers Ferry lock and dam.....	52,300,000	249,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	200,000
(FC) Montgomery.....	1,400,000	¹ 17,000	-----	\$63,000	-----	63,000	-----	63,000
(P) Walter F. George (Fort Gaines) lock and dam. Alabama and Georgia.....	87,000,000	23,125,000	14,900,000	-----	14,900,000	-----	14,900,000	-----
Alaska:								
(N) Dillingham Harbor.....	412,000	¹ 6,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	406,000	-----
(N) Naknek River.....	23,000	¹ 2,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	¹ (21,000)	-----
(N) Seldovia Harbor:								
(a) Channel work.....	249,000	¹ 4,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	² (245,000)	-----
Arizona:								
(FC) Alamo Reservoir.....	9,760,000	287,000	-----	65,000	-----	65,000	-----	65,000
(FC) Gila River.....	1,700,000	140,000	-----	30,000	-----	30,000	-----	50,000
(FC) Painted Rock Reservoir.....	19,000,000	13,829,000	5,171,000	-----	5,171,000	-----	5,171,000	-----
(FC) Whitlow Ranch Reservoir.....	3,800,000	1,897,000	1,903,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Arkansas:								
(N) Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma:								
(a) Emergency bank stabilization.....	31,286,000	27,286,000	4,000,000	-----	4,000,000	-----	4,000,000	-----
(b) Other bank stabilization.....	71,514,000	353,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	4,000,000	-----
(N) Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma (general studies).....	³ 3,358,000	2,100,000	-----	900,000	-----	900,000	-----	900,000
Bayou Bartholomew, Ark. and La. (See Louisiana)								
(P) Beaver Reservoir.....	56,100,000	1,291,000	-----	-----	1,500,000	-----	1,500,000	-----
(P) Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (additions of units Nos. 5 and 6).....	7,530,000	585,000	1,200,000	-----	1,200,000	-----	1,200,000	-----
(FC) Clarksville.....	273,000	14,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	² (259,000)	-----
(P) Dardanelle lock and dam.....	94,600,000	4,485,000	5,000,000	-----	3,400,000	-----	3,400,000	-----
(P) DeGray Reservoir.....	32,000,000	165,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	150,000
(FC) Gillham Reservoir.....	10,100,000	¹ 6,000	-----	-----	-----	80,000	-----	80,000
(P) Greers Ferry Reservoir.....	56,100,000	6,588,000	11,130,000	-----	11,130,000	-----	11,130,000	-----
(FC) McKinney Bayou and Barkman Creek, Ark. and Tex.	1,350,000	308,000	600,000	-----	600,000	-----	600,000	-----
(FC) Millwood Reservoir.....	54,400,000	378,000	-----	172,000	-----	172,000	-----	172,000
(FC) Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex.	9,880,000	7,416,000	700,000	-----	400,000	-----	700,000	-----
Table Rock Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (See Missouri.)								

California:									
(FC)	Black Butte Reservoir.....	18,300,000	1,187,000	2,500,000	-----	2,500,000	-----	2,500,000	-----
(FC)	Carbon Canyon Dam and Channel.....	6,000,000	2,644,000	2,000,000	-----	2,000,000	-----	2,000,000	-----
(FC)	Devil East Twin Warm and Lytle Creeks.....	10,700,000	3,582,000	2,000,000	-----	2,000,000	-----	2,000,000	-----
(FC)	Eel River.....	944,000	436,000	508,000	-----	508,000	-----	508,000	-----
(N)	Halfmoon Bay Harbor.....	5,210,000	1,083,000	1,500,000	-----	1,500,000	-----	1,500,000	-----
(FC)	Los Angeles County Drainage Area.....	338,000,000	193,945,000	15,500,000	-----	15,500,000	-----	15,500,000	-----
(FC)	Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries.....	12,300,000	3,127,000	1,000,000	-----	1,000,000	-----	1,000,000	-----
(FC)	Middle Creek.....	1,550,000	900,000	650,000	-----	650,000	-----	650,000	-----
(FC)	Mill Creek levees.....	1,740,000	107,000	-----	-----	500,000	-----	500,000	-----
(FC)	New Hogan Reservoir.....	19,300,000	740,000	-----	-----	1,500,000	-----	1,500,000	-----
(FC)	Oroville Reservoir.....	50,000,000	175,000	-----	30,000	-----	30,000	-----	30,000
(FC)	Pine Flat Reservoir.....	41,200,000	39,068,000	75,000	-----	75,000	-----	75,000	-----
(N)	Playa Del Rey Inlet and Basin.....	3,231,000	1,762,000	500,000	-----	500,000	-----	500,000	-----
(N)	Port Hueneme Harbor.....	6,115,000	879,000	3,000,000	-----	3,000,000	-----	3,000,000	-----
(N)	Redwood City Harbor: 30-foot depth San Bruno Shoal entrance and Redwood Creek channels.....	1,380,000	12,000	-----	-----	1,378,000	-----	1,378,000	-----
(FC)	Russian River Reservoir.....	13,802,000	11,290,000	250,000	-----	250,000	-----	250,000	-----
(FC)	Sacramento River.....	78,200,000	61,612,000	2,500,000	-----	2,500,000	-----	2,500,000	-----
(FC)	Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries.....	23,000,000	3,705,000	1,100,000	-----	1,100,000	-----	1,100,000	-----
(FC)	Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff.....	1,750,000	18,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	50,000
(N)	Sacramento River deepwater ship channel.....	45,600,000	14,031,000	7,500,000	-----	6,500,000	-----	7,500,000	-----
(FC)	San Antonio and Chino Creeks.....	11,700,000	8,040,000	1,800,000	-----	1,800,000	-----	1,800,000	-----
(FC)	San Jacinto River and Bautista Creek.....	5,770,000	215,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	225,000	-----
(N)	San Joaquin River-Stockton deepwater channel.....	10,990,000	1,861,000	250,000	-----	250,000	-----	250,000	-----
(FC)	San Lorenzo Creek.....	6,240,000	2,144,000	1,700,000	-----	1,700,000	-----	1,700,000	-----
(FC)	San Lorenzo River.....	4,333,000	4,059,000	274,000	-----	274,000	-----	274,000	-----
(FC)	Santa Clara River.....	2,930,000	567,000	1,300,000	-----	1,300,000	-----	1,300,000	-----
(N)	Santa Cruz Harbor.....	1,740,000	110,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	400,000	-----
(FC)	Santa Maria Valley levees.....	11,400,000	694,000	2,200,000	-----	2,200,000	-----	2,200,000	-----
(FC)	Stewart Canyon Basin.....	1,670,000	88,000	-----	62,000	-----	62,000	-----	62,000
(FC)	Success Reservoir.....	14,200,000	7,148,000	4,000,000	-----	4,000,000	-----	4,000,000	-----
(FC)	Terminus Reservoir.....	21,500,000	6,125,000	5,500,000	-----	5,500,000	-----	5,500,000	-----
	Truckee River and tributaries, California and Nevada. (See Nevada.)								
(FC)	Tuolumne River reservoirs (New Don Pedro).....	3,170,000	40,000	-----	25,000	-----	25,000	-----	25,000
Colorado:									
(FC)	Trinidad Reservoir.....	19,200,000	195,000	-----	75,000	-----	75,000	-----	75,000
Connecticut:									
(FC)	East Branch Reservoir.....	2,010,000	120,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	75,000
(FC)	Hall Meadow Brook Reservoir.....	2,210,000	120,000	-----	75,000	250,000	-----	250,000	-----
(FC)	Mad River Reservoir.....	5,970,000	118,000	-----	75,000	275,000	-----	275,000	-----
(FC)	Thomaston Reservoir.....	14,300,000	8,138,000	4,800,000	-----	4,800,000	-----	4,800,000	-----
Delaware:									
(N)	Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md.: (a) Canal improvement.....	94,150,000	231,000	-----	180,000	-----	180,000	-----	180,000
	(b) Summit Bridge.....	8,250,000	5,160,000	3,090,000	-----	3,090,000	-----	3,090,000	-----

See footnotes at end of table, p. 21.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1960—Continued

10

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1960

Construction, general, State and project (1)	Total estimated Federal cost (2)	Amount appropriated to date (3)	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1960		Amount allowed by House		Committee recommendation	
			Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
Florida:								
(N) Apalachicola Bay:								
(a) Channel at East Point: Reimbursement	\$39,100				\$39,100		\$39,100	
(b) St. George Island: Reimbursement	43,000				43,000		43,000	
(FC) Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(N) Central and southern Florida	237,500,000	\$49,122,000	\$9,000,000		9,000,000		9,000,000	
(N) Escambia River	95,000	17,000					2 (88,000)	
(N) Intracoastal Waterway, Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River	6,860,000	370,000					1,000,000	
(N) Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami	19,200,000	6,456,000	1,130,000		20,000		1,130,000	
(N) St. Joseph Bay, Port St. Joe Harbor	1,730,000	547,000	1,183,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N) Tampa Harbor								
Deepening of Tampa Harbor Channel	14,400,000	9,728,000	3,672,000		3,672,000		3,672,000	
Georgia:								
(N) Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(N) Brunswick Harbor	1,910,000	168,000	1,150,000		1,150,000		1,150,000	
(P) Columbia lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)								
(N) Hartwell Reservoir, Ga. and S.C.	98,600,000	28,443,000	26,400,000		26,400,000		26,400,000	
(N) Savannah River below Augusta	3,710,000	1,337,000	950,000		950,000		950,000	
(N) Walter F. George (Port Gaines) lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)								
Hawaii:								
(N) Honolulu Harbor	810,000	1,000,000	1,720,000		1,720,000		1,720,000	
(N) Kahului Harbor	93,000	118,000					140,000	
(FC) Wailoa Stream	477,000	114,000		\$28,000		\$28,000		\$28,000
Idaho:								
(P) Bruce's Eddy Reservoir (construction not yet authorized)	132,000,000	630,000		770,000		770,000		770,000
(FC) Columbia River local protection:								
(a) Boise Valley	650,000	59,000		41,000		41,000		41,000
(b) Heise-Roberts extension	5,650,000	36,000		75,000		75,000		75,000
Illinois:								
(FC) Beardstown	5,280,000	2,274,000	688,000		688,000		688,000	
(FC) Carlyle Reservoir	40,100,000	1,695,000	2,640,000		2,640,000		2,640,000	
(BA) Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R.R. bridge, including channel change	4,089,500	505,000	2,064,000		2,064,000		2,064,000	
(FC) Clear Creek Drainage and Levee District	5,200,000	4,209,000	200,000		200,000		200,000	
(N) Dam 27, Mississippi River between St. Louis and lock and dam 26	6,300,000	962,000	1,758,000		1,758,000		1,758,000	
(FC) Drury Drainage District	1,520,000	84,000			540,000		540,000	

(FC)	East St. Louis and vicinity.....	23,700,000	11,461,000	2,300,000	-----	2,300,000	-----	2,300,000	-----
(FC)	Henderson River: Diversion unit.....	1,750,000	150,000	-----	-----	550,000	-----	550,000	-----
(FC)	Hunt Drainage District and Lima Lake Drainage District.....	5,420,000	174,000	-----	-----	1,000,000	-----	1,000,000	-----
(N)	Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag Channel, part I.....	92,500,000	24,954,000	8,600,000	-----	7,670,000	-----	8,600,000	-----
(N)	Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.: Regulating works.....	61,900,000	43,794,000	1,500,000	-----	1,500,000	-----	1,500,000	-----
(N)	Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn.: Rectification of damages.....	5,123,000	2,398,000	65,000	-----	65,000	-----	65,000	-----
(FC)	Shelbyville Reservoir.....	17,600,000	198,000	-----	50,000	-----	50,000	-----	50,000
(FC)	Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1 and Bay Island Drainage and Levee District No. 1.....	4,180,000	110,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	50,000
(FC)	The Sny Basin.....	22,000,000	1,142,000	1,000,000	-----	1,000,000	-----	1,000,000	-----
(BA)	Wabash RR. bridges at Meredosia and Valley City.....	2,820,000	2,292,000	528,000	-----	528,000	-----	528,000	-----
(FC)	Wilson and Wenkel and Prairie Du Pont Drainage and Levee District.....	5,320,000	4,993,000	327,000	-----	327,000	-----	327,000	-----
(FC)	Wood River Drainage and Levee District.....	15,600,000	11,319,000	1,100,000	-----	1,100,000	-----	1,100,000	-----
Indiana:									
(N)	Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky.....	65,900,000	130,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	150,000	-----
(FC)	Clinton (deferred for restudy).....	93,000	2,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	5,000	-----
(FC)	Evansville.....	13,000,000	2,497,000	430,000	-----	430,000	-----	430,000	-----
(FC)	Huntington Reservoir.....	14,200,000	128,000	-----	25,000	-----	25,000	-----	25,000
(FC)	Levee Unit No. 5, Wabash River.....	10,000,000	96,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
(FC)	Lock and dam 41, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Kentucky.)								
(FC)	Mansfield Reservoir.....	7,050,000	5,387,000	1,663,000	-----	1,663,000	-----	1,663,000	-----
(FC)	Mason J. Niblack levee.....	3,110,000	76,000	-----	54,000	-----	54,000	-----	54,000
	Markland lock and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)								
(FC)	Mississinewa Reservoir.....	22,000,000	128,000	-----	150,000	-----	150,000	-----	150,000
(FC)	Monroe Reservoir.....	4,960,000	55,000	-----	75,000	-----	75,000	-----	75,000
(FC)	Salamonie Reservoir.....	15,500,000	128,000	-----	150,000	-----	150,000	-----	150,000
(FC)	Sugar Creek Levee.....	355,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	15,000	-----
(FC)	Terre Haute-Conover Levee (deferred for restudy).....	199,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	2,000	-----
(FC)	Vincennes.....	4,960,000	3,379,000	200,000	-----	200,000	-----	200,000	-----
(FC)	West Terre Haute.....	473,000	15,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	30,000	-----
Iowa:									
(FC)	Floyd River and tributaries.....	9,100,000	220,000	-----	100,000	-----	100,000	-----	100,000
(FC)	Green Bay Levee and Drainage District No. 2.....	1,570,000	12,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	75,000	-----
(FC)	Iowa River-Flint Creek Levee District No. 16.....	7,920,000	220,000	-----	100,000	-----	100,000	-----	100,000
(FC)	Little Sioux River.....	15,500,000	7,213,000	2,500,000	-----	2,500,000	-----	2,500,000	-----
(N)	Missouri River Channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska:								
	(a) Sioux City, Iowa, to Omaha, Nebr.....	112,000,000	58,909,000	6,420,000	-----	5,600,000	-----	6,420,000	-----
	(b) Omaha, Nebr., to Kansas City.....	115,000,000	99,628,000	2,800,000	-----	2,800,000	-----	2,800,000	-----
	(c) Kansas City to the mouth.....	122,000,000	111,820,000	3,475,000	-----	3,475,000	-----	3,475,000	-----
(FC)	Muscatine Island Levee District and Muscatine Louisa County Drainage District No. 13.....	4,300,000	471,000	860,000	-----	860,000	-----	860,000	-----
(FC)	Red Rock Reservoir.....	71,400,000	1,717,000	-----	113,000	1,113,000	-----	1,113,000	-----
(FC)	Saylorville Reservoir.....	47,000,000	185,000	-----	-----	200,000	-----	200,000	-----

see footnotes at end of table, p. 21.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1960—Continued

12

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1960

Construction, general, State and project (1)	Total estimated Federal cost (2)	Amount appropriated to date (3)	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1960		Amount allowed by House		Committee recommendation	
			Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
Kansas:								
(F) Abilene.....	\$1,170,000	\$832,000	\$338,000		\$338,000		\$338,000	
(F) Cedar Point Reservoir.....	6,450,000	¹ 17,000						\$25,000
(F) Council Grove Reservoir.....	12,700,000	303,000			300,000		300,000	
(F) Elk City Reservoir.....	25,000,000	274,000					400,000	
(F) Frankfort.....	940,000	¹ 11,000						50,000
(F) John Redmond (Strawn) Reservoir.....	32,800,000	894,000	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
(F) Kansas Citys, Kans. and Mo.....	44,300,000	39,394,000					250,000	
(F) Manhattan.....	1,770,000	338,000	450,000		450,000		450,000	
(F) Marion Reservoir.....	7,540,000	¹ 21,000				\$25,000		25,000
(F) Marysville.....	394,000	¹ 1,000		\$26,000		26,000		26,000
(F) Milford Reservoir.....	45,700,000	290,000		170,000		170,000		170,000
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(F) Ottawa.....	4,200,000	1,373,000	1,400,000		1,400,000		1,400,000	
(F) Perry Reservoir.....	18,500,000	190,000		125,000		125,000		125,000
(F) Pomona Reservoir.....	14,100,000	1,043,000	1,400,000		1,400,000		1,400,000	
(F) Salina.....	3,760,000	1,730,000	2,030,000		2,030,000		2,030,000	
(F) Topeka.....	16,800,000	4,934,000	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
(F) Tuttle Creek Reservoir.....	85,900,000	41,043,000	18,345,000		18,345,000		18,345,000	
(F) Wilson Reservoir.....	18,100,000	259,000		161,000		161,000	500,000	161,000
Kentucky:								
(P) Barkley Dam (lower Cumberland lock and dam), Kentucky and Tennessee.....	182,000,000	16,090,000	19,000,000		19,000,000		19,000,000	
(F) Buckhorn Reservoir.....	10,300,000	6,773,000	3,527,000		3,027,000		3,027,000	
Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana).								
(F) Fishtrap Reservoir.....	39,400,000	181,000		200,000		200,000		400,000
(N) Greenup locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio.....	57,600,000	37,108,000	10,265,000		9,265,000		9,265,000	
(N) Lock and dam 41, Indiana and Kentucky.....	48,700,000	9,439,000	10,300,000		10,300,000		10,300,000	
(N) Markland locks and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio.....	73,600,000	28,407,000	11,627,000		9,827,000		9,827,000	
(N) New Richmond locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio.....	76,600,000	4,691,000	9,300,000		9,300,000		9,300,000	
(F) Nolin Reservoir.....	14,400,000	726,000	1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000	
(F) No. 2 Barren Reservoir.....	23,500,000	214,000			1,000,000		1,000,000	
(F) No. 2 Green Reservoir.....	8,470,000	¹ 17,000						50,000
(F) Rough River Reservoir and channels.....	9,700,000	7,355,000	2,315,000		2,315,000		2,315,000	

Louisiana:									
(FC)	Amite River and tributaries	3,440,000	2,236,000	1,204,000	-----	1,204,000	-----	1,204,000	-----
(N)	Aquatic plant control, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas	5,682,000	49,000	500,000	-----	500,000	-----	500,000	-----
(N)	Barataria Bay	2,400,000	85,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	1,000,000	-----
(FC)	Bayou Chevreuil	485,000	113,000	-----	42,000	-----	42,000	-----	42,000
(N)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway:								
	(a) Algiers Cutoff, Jefferson-Plaquemine Drainage District	1,420,000	-----	-----	-----	1,420,000	-----	1,420,000	-----
	(b) Plaquemine-Morgan City alternate route	27,300,000	16,603,000	5,951,000	-----	5,951,000	-----	5,951,000	-----
(N)	Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico	9,300,000	838,000	900,000	-----	900,000	-----	900,000	-----
(N)	Mississippi River gulf outlet	101,000,000	5,068,000	5,900,000	-----	5,900,000	-----	5,900,000	-----
(FC)	Mooringsport Reservoir, La. and Tex.	4,990,000	209,000	-----	100,000	-----	100,000	-----	100,000
	Red River levees below Denison Dam, Ark., La. and Tex. (See Arkansas.)								
Maryland:									
(N)	Baltimore Harbor and channels	30,000,000	18,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	1,500,000	-----
	Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (See Delaware.)								
Massachusetts:									
(N)	Boston Harbor:								
	(a) 40-foot anchorage and 35-foot area	5,360,000	4,507,000	853,000	-----	853,000	-----	853,000	-----
	(b) 35-foot reserved channel	829,000	14,000	-----	-----	825,000	-----	825,000	-----
(FC)	East Brimfield Reservoir	6,570,000	5,468,000	1,102,000	-----	1,102,000	-----	1,102,000	-----
(FC)	Littleville Reservoir	5,490,000	18,000	-----	100,000	-----	100,000	-----	100,000
(FC)	New Bedford-Fairhaven and Acushnet	11,464,000	580,000	-----	120,000	-----	120,000	-----	120,000
(FC)	North Adams	15,100,000	12,170,000	2,930,000	-----	2,930,000	-----	2,930,000	-----
(N)	Provincetown Harbor	2,260,000	15,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	600,000	-----
(FC)	West Hill Reservoir	2,400,000	498,000	1,000,000	-----	1,000,000	-----	1,000,000	-----
(FC)	Westville Reservoir	7,450,000	323,000	-----	-----	1,800,000	-----	1,800,000	-----
(FC)	Westville Reservoir	7,450,000	323,000	-----	-----	1,800,000	-----	1,800,000	-----
(N)	Weymouth Fore River	6,720,000	2,276,000	3,085,000	-----	3,085,000	-----	3,085,000	-----
Michigan:									
(FC)	Battle Creek	6,600,000	3,168,000	1,548,000	-----	1,548,000	-----	1,548,000	-----
(N)	Grand Marais Harbor	1,020,000	15,000	-----	-----	300,000	-----	300,000	-----
(N)	Great Lakes connecting channels	146,500,000	45,151,000	27,000,000	-----	27,000,000	-----	27,000,000	-----
(N)	Hammond Bay Harbor	1,100,000	23,000	-----	-----	20,000	-----	20,000	-----
(N)	Harrisville Harbor	1,500,000	968,000	532,000	-----	532,000	-----	532,000	-----
(BA)	Houghton-Hancock Bridge	4,400,000	1,760,000	2,640,000	-----	2,640,000	-----	2,640,000	-----
(N)	Little Lake Harbor	815,000	32,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	300,000	-----
(FC)	Saginaw River	19,000,000	1,225,000	-----	100,000	-----	100,000	-----	250,000
(N)	St. Marys River:								
	(a) Improvement of South Canal	5,100,000	2,557,000	2,543,000	-----	2,543,000	-----	2,543,000	-----
	(b) New Poe lock	40,100,000	358,000	-----	367,000	-----	367,000	-----	367,000
Minnesota:									
(FC)	Mankato and North Mankato	2,140,000	113,000	-----	47,000	-----	47,000	-----	47,000
(N)	Minnesota River 9-foot channel	2,760,000	56,000	-----	67,000	-----	67,000	-----	67,000
	Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn.: Rectification of damages. (See Illinois.)								
(FC)	Red River of the North, Minn. and N. Dak.	6,020,000	5,511,000	386,000	-----	386,000	-----	386,000	-----

See footnotes at end of table, p. 21.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1960—Continued

14

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1960

Construction, general, State and project (1)	Total estimated Federal cost (2)	Amount appropriated to date (3)	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1960		Amount allowed by House		Committee recommendation	
			Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
Minnesota—Continued								
(FC) Ruffy Brook and Lost River.....	\$753,000	\$163,000	\$300,000	-----	\$300,000	-----	\$300,000	-----
(N) St. Anthony Falls.....	35,600,000	13,664,000	2,440,000	-----	2,440,000	-----	2,440,000	-----
(N) St. Paul and South St. Paul.....	6,750,000	277,000	-----	\$163,000	-----	\$163,000	-----	\$163,000
Mississippi:								
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(N) Pascagoula Harbor.....	1,248,000	16,000	-----	-----	1,242,000	-----	1,242,000	-----
Missouri:								
(FC) Bear Creek Reservoir.....	2,320,000	527,000	1,032,000	-----	1,032,000	-----	1,032,000	-----
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (See Arkansas.)								
(FC) Canton.....	1,300,000	331,000	720,000	-----	720,000	-----	720,000	-----
(FC) Cape Girardeau and vicinity (reach No. 2 only).....	5,520,000	4,403,000	157,000	-----	157,000	-----	157,000	-----
(FC) Des Moines and Mississippi Levee District No. 1.....	1,690,000	103,000	-----	-----	500,000	-----	500,000	-----
(FC) Fabius River Drainage District.....	2,220,000	814,000	500,000	-----	500,000	-----	500,000	-----
(FC) Joanna Reservoir.....	45,200,000	340,000	-----	60,000	-----	-----	-----	-----
Kansas Citys, Kans. and Mo. (See Kansas.)								
(FC) Kasinger Bluff Reservoir.....	102,000,000	122,000	-----	150,000	-----	150,000	-----	150,000
(FC) Marion County Drainage District.....	960,000	12,000	-----	-----	-----	73,000	-----	73,000
(FC) Meramec River Reservoir-Cedar Hill, Meramec Park and Union (deferred for restudy).....	62,700,000	607,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	100,000
Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo. (See Illinois.)								
Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(FC) Pomme de Terre Reservoir.....	16,700,000	6,533,000	4,000,000	-----	4,000,000	-----	4,000,000	-----
(FC) St. Louis.....	126,000,000	3,069,000	4,200,000	-----	4,200,000	-----	4,200,000	-----
(FC) Stockton Reservoir.....	42,000,000	171,000	-----	150,000	-----	150,000	-----	150,000
(P) Table Rock Reservoir, Ark. and Mo.....	66,700,000	63,165,000	2,000,000	-----	2,000,000	-----	2,000,000	-----
Montana:								
(P) Fort Peck Dam (2d powerplant).....	26,000,000	10,316,000	8,250,000	-----	8,250,000	-----	8,250,000	-----
Nebraska:								
(FC) Gering and Mitchell Valleys.....	1,400,000	145,000	-----	50,000	350,000	-----	350,000	-----
Missouri River Channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(FC) Missouri River, Kenslers Bend, Nebr. to Sioux City, Iowa (including Miners Bend), Iowa, Nebr., and S. Dak.....	11,200,000	9,413,000	900,000	-----	900,000	-----	900,000	-----
(FC) Salt Creek and tributaries.....	14,600,000	170,000	-----	90,000	-----	90,000	310,000	90,000
Nevada:								
(FC) Truckee River and tributaries, California and Nevada.....	1,200,000	329,000	550,000	-----	550,000	-----	550,000	-----

(FC)	New Hampshire:								
	Hopkinton-Everett Reservoirs.....	30,800,000	2,167,000	5,568,000	5,568,000	5,568,000	5,568,000	5,568,000	-----
(N)	New Jersey:								
	Delaware River, Philadelphia Naval Base to Trenton, N.J. and Pa.....	96,000,000	28,205,000	13,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000	-----
(N)	Newark Bay, Hackensack, and Passaic Rivers.....	2,450,000	¹ 15,000	-----	-----	-----	600,000	-----	-----
(N)	New York and New Jersey channels, New York and New Jersey.....	58,650,000	55,860,000	2,790,000	2,790,000	2,790,000	2,790,000	2,790,000	-----
	Staten Island Rapid Transit bridge, New York and New Jersey. (See New York.)	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
	New Mexico:								
(FC)	Abiquiu Reservoir.....	18,000,000	6,901,000	3,300,000	3,300,000	3,300,000	3,300,000	3,300,000	-----
(FC)	Carlsbad.....	2,020,000	72,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	-----
(FC)	Rio Grande Floodway, Cochiti to Rio Puerco.....	4,400,000	90,000	-----	-----	-----	800,000	-----	-----
(FC)	Socorro.....	3,330,000	80,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	-----
(FC)	Two Rivers Reservoir.....	6,900,000	390,000	-----	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	-----
	New York:								
	Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y. (See Penn- sylvania.)	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
(N)	Barcelona Harbor.....	1,130,000	624,000	506,000	506,000	506,000	506,000	506,000	-----
(N)	Buffalo Harbor, north entrance.....	14,300,000	6,444,000	2,150,000	2,150,000	2,150,000	2,150,000	2,150,000	-----
(N)	Buttermilk Channel.....	2,910,000	1,359,000	-----	-----	-----	1,500,000	-----	-----
(FC)	Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal.....	6,500,000	4,118,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	-----
(SP)	Fire Island Inlet.....	2,890,000	841,000	450,000	220,000	220,000	220,000	220,000	-----
(N)	Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway.....	38,950,000	24,135,000	730,000	730,000	730,000	730,000	730,000	-----
(FC)	Herkimer.....	630,000	¹ 7,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	48,000	-----
(N)	Hudson River, New York City to Albany 32-foot channel.....	36,300,000	¹ 65,000	-----	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	-----
(N)	Irondequoit Bay.....	2,230,000	132,000	129,000	-----	-----	129,000	-----	-----
	New York and New Jersey channels, New York and New Jersey. (See New Jersey.)	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
(N)	New York Harbor-New Jersey pierhead line.....	5,740,000	4,429,000	-----	-----	-----	500,000	-----	-----
(N)	New York Harbor, 35-foot channel from ocean to New York Bayside Channel.....	1,760,000	¹ 13,000	-----	-----	-----	350,000	-----	-----
(FC)	Nichols.....	785,000	¹ 10,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	-----
(BA)	Ohio Street Bridge, Buffalo River.....	4,520,000	-----	-----	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	-----
(N)	Oswego Harbor.....	2,400,000	1,743,000	657,000	657,000	657,000	657,000	657,000	-----
(BA)	Staten Island Rapid Transit bridge, New York and New Jersey.....	8,165,000	6,165,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	-----
	North Carolina:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
(N)	Morehead City Harbor.....	1,382,000	¹ 12,000	-----	-----	-----	600,000	-----	-----
(FC)	Panega and Cucklers Creek.....	536,000	¹ 13,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	51,000	51,000	-----
(FC)	Wilkesboro Reservoir.....	8,350,000	387,000	-----	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	-----
	North Dakota:								
(P)	Garrison Reservoir.....	294,000,000	279,860,000	5,050,000	5,050,000	5,050,000	5,050,000	5,050,000	-----
(FC)	Lower Heart River.....	2,100,000	750,000	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000	-----
	Red River of the North, Minn. and N. Dak. (See Minnesota.)	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

See footnotes at end of table, p. 21.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1960—Continued

16

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1960

Construction, general, State and project (1)	Total estimated Federal cost (2)	Amount appropriated to date (3)	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1960		Amount allowed by House		Committee recommendation	
			Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
Ohio:								
(N) <i>Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia</i> -----	\$54,400,000	¹ \$52,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	\$125,000
(N) Cleveland Harbor:								
(a) <i>Bridge replacements, widening Cuyahoga and Old Rivers, deepen channel in east basin of outer harbor</i> -----	16,900,000	¹ 26,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	200,000
(b) <i>Bridge replacements and dredging of Cuyahoga and Old Rivers to 23 feet</i> -----	18,520,000	18,015,000	\$400,000	-----	\$400,000	-----	\$400,000	-----
(FC) Dillon Reservoir-----	29,800,000	21,446,000	5,160,000	-----	5,160,000	-----	5,160,000	-----
Greenup locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)								
Markland lock and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)								
(FC) Muskingum River Reservoirs-----	40,800,000	40,185,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	500,000	-----
(N) New Cumberland locks and dam, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia-----	41,500,000	29,052,000	6,800,000	-----	6,800,000	-----	6,800,000	-----
New Richmond locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)								
(N) Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia-----	63,500,000	1,068,000	3,500,000	-----	3,500,000	-----	3,500,000	-----
(FC) Roseville-----	750,000	466,000	284,000	-----	284,000	-----	284,000	-----
Shenango River Reservoir, Pa. and Ohio. (See Pennsylvania.)								
(FC) West Branch Mahoning River Reservoir-----	6,940,000	261,000	-----	\$229,000	525,000	-----	525,000	-----
Oklahoma:								
Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma: Bank stabilization. (See Arkansas.)								
Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma (general studies). (See Arkansas.)								
(FC) Broken Bow Reservoir-----	10,700,000	156,000	-----	134,000	-----	\$134,000	-----	134,000
Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla. (See Texas.)								
(FC) Enid-----	1,490,000	318,000	600,000	-----	600,000	-----	600,000	-----
(P) Eufaula Reservoir-----	157,000,000	13,223,000	13,400,000	-----	13,400,000	-----	13,400,000	-----
(FC) Keystone Reservoir-----	137,000,000	12,141,000	10,000,000	-----	10,000,000	-----	10,000,000	-----
(FC) Lukfata Reservoir-----	15,100,000	¹ 9,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	50,000
(FC) Oologah Reservoir-----	35,100,000	19,896,000	12,500,000	-----	12,500,000	-----	12,500,000	-----
(FC) Pine Creek Reservoir-----	15,400,000	¹ 9,000	-----	-----	-----	80,000	-----	80,000
Oregon:								
(FC) Blue River Reservoir-----	15,800,000	423,000	-----	105,000	-----	105,000	-----	105,000

(N)	Columbia River between Vancouver Wash., and The Dalles, Oreg.:								
	(a) 27-foot channel.....	5,950,000	4,339,000	1,611,000		1,611,000		1,611,000	
	(b) Hood River small boat basin.....	380,000	11,000						18,000
(FC)	Columbia River local protection:							250,000	
	(a) Malheur River, Vale unit.....	423,000	70,000						23,000
(N)	Coos and Millicoma Rivers.....	520,000	17,000						
(P)	Cougar Reservoir.....	42,900,000	12,440,000	* 9,700,000		9,000,000		9,000,000	
(FC)	Fall Creek Reservoir.....	22,100,000	398,000		202,000		202,000		202,000
(P)	Green Peter Reservoir.....	60,800,000	1,104,000					1,500,000	
(P)	Hills Creek Reservoir.....	40,000,000	23,396,000	8,300,000		8,300,000		8,300,000	
(BA)	Interstate Bridge, Oreg. and Wash.....	1,177,000	47,000	1,130,000		1,130,000		1,130,000	
(P)	John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington.....	387,000,000	10,746,000	20,000,000		20,000,000		20,000,000	
(FC)	Lower Columbia River improvement to existing works:								
	(a) Clatsop County Diking District No. 6.....	56,000	11,000					(55,000)	
	(b) Multnomah County Drainage District.....	1,740,000	1,037,000	* 703,000		203,000		203,000	
	(c) Woodson Drainage District.....	88,000	7,000					(81,000)	
(N)	Rogue River Harbor at Gold Beach.....	4,700,000	732,000	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(P)	The Dalles lock and dam, Oregon and Washington.....	252,000,000	238,596,000	7,000,000		7,000,000		7,000,000	
(FC)	Willamette River Basin bank protection.....	12,100,000	7,322,000	500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Willamette River Basin channel improvement and major drainage:								
	Coyote and Spencer Creek.....	1,300,000	15,000						50,000
(N)	Yaquina Bay and Harbor.....	22,300,000	118,000				100,000		100,000
	Pennsylvania:								
(FC)	Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y.....	113,000,000	2,733,000					1,400,000	
(FC)	Allentown.....	1,810,000	1,130,000	680,000		680,000		680,000	
(FC)	Bear Creek Reservoir.....	11,700,000	6,939,000	3,400,000		3,400,000		3,400,000	
(FC)	Bethlehem.....	9,300,000	594,000	1,050,000		600,000		600,000	
(FC)	Bradford.....	8,600,000	5,173,000	2,400,000		2,400,000		2,400,000	
(FC)	Brookville.....	1,340,000	87,000		73,000	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Curwensville Reservoir.....	28,000,000	244,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(N)	Dam 8, Monongahela River, Pa. and W. Va.	3,500,000	2,775,000	725,000		725,000		725,000	
	Delaware River, Philadelphia Naval Base to Trenton, New Jersey and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.)								
(FC)	Dyberry Reservoir.....	4,000,000	3,610,000	390,000		390,000		390,000	
(FC)	Kettle Creek Reservoir.....	13,600,000	1,154,000	2,500,000		1,900,000		1,900,000	
(N)	Maxwell locks and dam, Monongahela River	30,400,000	395,000		95,000		95,000	500,000	95,000
	New Cumberland locks and dam, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
(FC)	Prompton Reservoir.....	3,700,000	2,580,000	1,120,000		1,120,000		1,120,000	
(FC)	Ridgway.....	608,000	22,000		25,000		25,000		25,000
(FC)	St. Marys.....	528,000	22,000		38,000		38,000		38,000
(FC)	Shenango River Reservoir, Pa. and Ohio.....	28,000,000	374,000		150,000	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Stillwater Reservoir.....	6,000,000	3,760,000	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Turtle Creek.....	14,400,000	195,000						25,000
(FC)	Tyrone.....	9,000,000	166,000		85,000		85,000		85,000
(FC)	Washington, Charliers Creek.....	1,460,000	62,000		78,000		78,000		78,000
	Puerto Rico:								
(N)	San Juan Harbor.....	7,000,000	115,000						50,000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 21.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1960—Continued

18

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1960

Construction, general, State and project (1)	Total estimated Federal cost (2)	Amount appropriated to date (3)	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1960		Amount allowed by House		Committee recommendation	
			Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
Rhode Island:								
(FO) Fox Point barrier, Narragansett Bay.....	\$12,831,000	\$700,000		\$200,000		\$200,000		\$200,000
(FO) Woonsocket.....	4,200,000	3,830,000	\$370,000		\$370,000		\$370,000	
South Carolina:								
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
Hartwell Reservoir, Ga. and S.C. (See Georgia.)								
South Dakota:								
(P) Big Bend Reservoir.....	137,000,000	1,059,000	2,600,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
(P) Fort Randall Reservoir.....	193,000,000	187,821,000	1,150,000		1,150,000		1,150,000	
(P) Oahe Reservoir.....	380,000,000	158,015,000	43,500,000		43,500,000		43,500,000	
(FO) Sioux Falls.....	5,470,000	4,218,000	1,252,000		1,252,000		1,252,000	
Tennessee:								
Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn. (See Kentucky.)								
(P) Cordell Hull (Carlhage) Dam.....	43,600,000	206,000						200,000
Texas:								
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(N) Brazos Island Harbor.....	5,820,000	2,778,000	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FO) Buffalo Bayou and tributaries.....	51,531,000	21,016,000	1,650,000		1,650,000		1,650,000	
(FO) Canyon Reservoir.....	15,700,000	2,931,000	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
(FO) Cooper Reservoir and channels.....	13,600,000	1,389,000	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
(BA) Corpus Christi Bridge.....	4,821,000	3,880,000	486,000		486,000		486,000	
(P) Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla.:								
Highway bridge at Willis Ferry site.....	3,528,000	2,473,000	700,000		700,000		700,000	
(N) Galveston Harbor and channel, seawall.....	9,230,000	1,586,000	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
(N) Gulf Intracoastal Waterway:								
(a) Channel to Port Mansfield.....	3,446,000	15,000					150,000	
(b) Colorado River channel.....	1,310,000	54,000					400,000	
(c) Guadalupe River channel to Victoria.....	8,240,000	1,425,000	600,000		600,000		600,000	
(d) Realigned route, vicinity Aransas Pass.....	3,085,000	2,123,000	962,000		962,000		962,000	
(N) Houston ship channel:								
(a) 36-foot channel and widening.....	8,420,000	6,443,000	1,150,000		1,400,000		1,400,000	
(b) 40-foot project.....	16,340,000	18,000					1,500,000	
(FO) Lampasas Reservoir.....	29,400,000	255,000		125,000		125,000		125,000
(N) Matagorda ship channel:								
36-foot channel.....	11,300,000	133,000				150,000		150,000
(P) McGee Bend Dam.....	55,400,000	10,194,000	5,800,000		5,800,000		5,800,000	
McKinney Bayou and Barkman Creek, Ark. and Tex. (See Arkansas.)								
(FO) Mooringsport Reservoir, La. and Tex. (See Louisiana.)								
Navarro Mills Reservoir.....	6,450,000	268,000	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	

(FO)	Pecos.....	2,550,000	60,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
(N)	Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway:					
	(a) 36-foot channel and realinement at bascule bridge.....	6,000,000	2,174,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
	(b) Channel to La Quinta (reimbursement).....	959,000	15,000		954,000	954,000
(FO)	Proctor Reservoir.....	17,100,000	325,000		300,000	300,000
	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)					
(N)	Sabine-Neches Waterway.....	11,200,000	2,390,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FO)	San Antonio Channel.....	15,870,000	2,189,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
(FO)	Somerville Reservoir.....	14,300,000	97,000	85,000	85,000	85,000
(N)	Texas City Channel.....	1,520,000	472,000	913,000	913,000	913,000
(FO)	Texas City, Galveston Bay.....	6,240,000	149,000	125,000	125,000	125,000
(FO)	Waco Reservoir.....	39,750,000	1,430,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
	Utah:					
(FO)	Salt Lake City.....	1,880,000	541,000	1,339,000	1,339,000	1,339,000
	Vermont:					
(FO)	Ball Mountain Reservoir.....	10,500,000	6,417,000	2,560,000	2,560,000	2,560,000
(FO)	North Hartland Reservoir.....	7,050,000	3,288,000	2,571,000	2,571,000	2,571,000
(FO)	North Springfield Reservoir.....	6,800,000	3,725,000	2,040,000	2,040,000	2,040,000
(FO)	Townshend Reservoir.....	7,150,000	4,071,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
(FO)	Victory Reservoir.....	1,900,000	113,000			65,000
	Virgin Islands:					
(N)	Christiansted Harbor (inactive).....	1,412,000	2,000			3,000
	Virginia:					
(N)	Norfolk Harbor: Widen 40-foot channel and Craney Island anchorages.....	6,400,000	2,746,000	3,654,000	3,654,000	3,654,000
(FO)	Pound Reservoir.....	17,700,000	331,000	194,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
	Washington:					
(P)	Chief Joseph Dam.....	148,000,000	144,313,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
(N)	Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and The Dalles, Oreg.: (a) 27-Foot Channel, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)					
	(b) Bingen Barge Channel.....	191,000	1,000			10,000
(FO)	Howard A. Hanson (Eagle Gorge) Reservoir.....	35,500,000	22,027,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
(P)	Ice Harbor lock and dam.....	135,000,000	59,327,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000
	Interstate Bridge, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)					
	John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)					
(P)	Little Goose lock and dam.....	139,000,000	220,000		450,000	450,000
	Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)					
(FO)	Lower Columbia River improvement to existing works: Wohkiakum County Consolidated Diking District No. 1.....	1,320,000	85,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
(P)	Lower Granite lock and dam.....	118,000,000	232,000			200,000
(P)	Lower Monumental lock and dam.....	138,000,000	1,305,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
	The Dalles Dam, Oreg. and Wash. (See Oregon.)					

See footnotes at end of table, p. 21.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1960—Continued

20

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1960

Construction, general, State and project (1)	Total estimated Federal cost (2)	Amount appropriated to date (3)	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1960		Amount allowed by House		Committee recommendation	
			Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
West Virginia:								
Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
Dam 8, Monongahela River, Pa. and W. Va. (See Pennsylvania.)								
(FC) Fast Rainelle.....	\$840,000	\$58,000			\$500,000		\$500,000	
(N) Hildebrand lock and dam.....	12,460,000	11,182,000	\$1,278,000		1,278,000		1,278,000	
New Cumberland locks and dam, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
(N) Opekiska locks and dam.....	21,900,000	272,000					500,000	
Oppossum Creek locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
(FC) Princeton.....	1,085,000	74,000					500,000	
Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
(FC) Summersville Reservoir.....	46,800,000	685,000			2,000,000		2,000,000	
(FC) Sutton Reservoir.....	35,600,000	31,183,000	74,417,000		3,417,000		3,417,000	
(FC) Williamson.....	665,000	14,000		\$71,000		\$71,000		\$71,000
Wisconsin:								
(FC) Bad River:								
(a) Mellen Channel.....	449,000	118,000						25,000
(b) Odanah, moving village and raising school.....	511,000	125,000						25,000
(N) Bayfield Harbor.....	251,000	120,000	131,000		131,000		131,000	
(FC) Eau Galle River.....	7,250,000	180,000						75,000
(N) Saxon Harbor.....	453,000	112,000				31,000		31,000
(N) Two Rivers Harbor.....	77,000	13,000					2(74,000)	
Wyoming:								
(FC) Jackson Hole.....	2,700,000	886,000	650,000		650,000		650,000	
(FC) Sheridan.....	1,800,000	590,000	300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC) Local protection projects not requiring specific legislation.....							4,000,000	
(FC) Snagging and clearing.....			600,000		600,000		600,000	
Projects deferred for restudy.....				10,000		10,000		10,000
Recreation facilities completed projects.....			1,250,000		1,250,000		2,500,000	

Small authorized projects-----							3,000,000	
Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages-----			-30,000,000		-43,000,000		-30,000,000	
Total-----	9,571,122,600	3,046,254,000	649,700,000	9,100,000	648,224,100	9,376,000	696,344,100	11,990,000
Lower Columbia River Fish Sanctuary program, Fish and Wildlife Service-----	37,559,000	16,951,000	1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000	
Coordination Act studies, Fish and Wildlife Service-----							500,000	
Grand total, construction, general-----	9,608,681,600	3,063,205,000	650,900,000 (\$660,000,000)	9,100,000	649,424,100 (\$658,800,100)	9,376,000	698,044,100 (\$710,034,100)	11,990,000

¹ Amount shown is costs incurred for preauthorization studies only.

² Eligible for selection under a lump-sum appropriation for small authorized projects.

³ Estimated cost is for general studies only.

⁴ Not yet authorized.

⁵ Fiscal year 1960 funds request for Cougar project reduced to \$9,000,000 during testimony before subcommittee.

⁶ Fiscal year 1960 funds request for Multnomah project reduced to \$203,000 during testimony before subcommittee.

⁷ Fiscal year 1960 funds request for Sutton project reduced to \$3,417,000 during testimony before subcommittee.

ARKANSAS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

OTHER BANK STABILIZATION AND CHANNEL RECTIFICATION

Testimony before the committee has established the engineering and economic desirability of initiating at this time the bank stabilization program for the Arkansas River. It was stated that a more economical prosecution of this work would be obtained if the bank stabilization were undertaken at this time, rather than postponed until a later date. This work is required to stabilize the banks prior to construction of the low-head locks and dams and in addition will prevent the loss of valuable topsoil by bank caving. From a construction standpoint, it was pointed out that there would be a distinct advantage to undertaking this work prior to the closure of Eufaula and Dardanelle Reservoirs in Oklahoma, which would effectively cut off a large portion of the silt load carried in the Arkansas River. This silt can be effectively utilized in connection with the channel stabilization work.

Columbia lock and dam, Alabama, Georgia.—It is the committee's recommendation that the Columbia lock and dam shall be renamed the George Andrews lock and dam.

Hartwell Reservoir, Ga.—It is also the committee's recommendation that the Hartwell Reservoir shall be renamed the Paul Brown Reservoir.

BLACK BUTTE RESERVOIR, CALIF.

The committee concurs in the views of the House committee that construction of this project should not proceed until contracts for the repayment of the cost of conservation storage have been executed. The committee therefore directs that no new contracts or commitments be entered into until the aforementioned repayment contracts have been executed.

NEW HOGAN RESERVOIR, CALIF.

The committee agrees with the House committee's comments to the effect that none of the funds appropriated for the new Hogan Dam shall be available to initiate construction of the project until contracts for repayment of the cost of conservation storage have been executed.

INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI

The committee has restored the budget estimate for this project. Contracts have already been awarded for dredging the channel from Sebastian to Fort Pierce. Unless the waterway is completed to that point, part of the funds expended for the improvement thus far cannot be effectively utilized for navigation, inasmuch as Fort Pierce provides a point of entry and exit for barges loaded to the authorized channel depth.

The committee concurs in the views of the House as to the desirability of a further economic study to determine the benefit-to-cost ratio for the uncompleted portion of the Intracoastal Waterway; that is, from Fort Pierce to Miami. It is understood that such a report can be completed within 1 year; and, therefore, the committee will have an opportunity to review this project in connection with the fiscal year 1961 budget estimates.

ILLINOIS WATERWAY, ILL.

CALUMET-SAC MODIFICATION

The committee has restored the \$930,000 programed for the Western Avenue Highway Bridge deleted by the House. Initiation of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad bridge will necessitate the closing of the present Western Avenue Bridge, which is part of the main north-south highway artery serving Chicago. To avoid the uneconomical delays and difficulties involved in detouring this huge volume of highway traffic, the new Western Avenue Bridge should be completed before the railroad bridge is initiated.

With respect to the retroactive application of the amended Truman-Hobbs Act, it should be noted that the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1958, specifically modified the requirements of local cooperation on this project with respect to the altering or rebuilding obstructive highway bridges. It is further noted that in giving assurances that they would rebuild restrictive highway bridges within a period of 5 years after commencement of actual construction, all highway bridge owners stipulated that they would bear only that portion of the costs that local interests would be required to assume and accept under Federal laws existing at the time of the bridge alteration.

The committee feels that a delay in initiating the reconstruction of the Western Avenue Bridge will adversely affect the planning and construction schedules of the railroads and other local interests, whose cooperation in accomplishing their associated work relating to the Federal project is vital to its overall completion on schedule.

MONROE RESERVOIR, IND.

The budget estimate and the amount allowed by the House for preconstruction planning on this project is \$75,000.

The Corps of Engineers testified that they have a capability of \$100,000 on this project during fiscal year 1960.

Local interests are required to pay 54 percent of the cost of this project for the conservation features. The State of Indiana has appropriated \$1,000,000 for their initial contribution toward the cost of planning and construction. They have offered to contribute at this time the sum of \$25,000 toward the cost of preconstruction planning in order that the Corps may be financed to their full capability in fiscal year 1960.

The committee would have no objection to the Corps of Engineers accepting a contribution from the State of Indiana which together with the recommended appropriation of \$75,000 would finance the planning on this project to the full capability of the Corps of Engineers.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BETWEEN MISSOURI RIVER AND MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.
(RECTIFICATION OF DAMAGE)

The committee concurs in the views of the House as to the desirability of requesting funds in fiscal year 1961 for the lump-sum payment for the capitalized cost of damages, rather than continuing the annual payments.

MISSOURI RIVER CHANNEL STABILIZATION, IOWA, KANSAS, MISSOURI,
AND NEBRASKA

The budget estimate and the bill as passed the House contains the following proviso:

: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated for "Construction, General," in this Act shall be used on the project "Missouri River, Kansas City to the Mouth," for any purpose other than bank stabilization work

The committee has recommended that the above proviso be stricken from the bill. This limitation restricts the use of funds in connection with navigation to maintain the existing project. As long as that restriction remains in the bill it will be impossible to provide the authorized 9-foot channel for navigation in the reach from Kansas City to the mouth and, of course, it would prohibit effective 9-foot navigation in the reach above Kansas City.

Navigation is one of the features of the multiple-purpose project for the Missouri River. The committee is convinced that completion of the authorized channel improvement would draw new industry to the areas along the Missouri River and would be an incentive to the further economic development of Missouri and other States along this potential artery of commerce. Such economic growth would mean more traffic for all types of shippers: The railroads, the truck-lines, and the airlines, as well as the bargelines.

Commerce on the Missouri River, even with present limited channel depths, is showing substantial increases. For instance, by June 1 of last year 141,000 tons of commercial traffic had moved on the river. This year by June 1, 232,000 tons had moved, an increase of 65 percent. Last year, the total tonnage figure was 596,000 tons. If the current rate continues for the balance of the navigation season, the total will be approximately 986,000 tons this year.

The committee is of the opinion that it is time that the restriction preventing the attainment of the full benefits from the Missouri River project be removed.

MILFORD RESERVOIR, KANS.

The committee was impressed with the presentation made by local interests for the initiation of construction of the Milford Reservoir. The committee believes that it is an important unit in the plan for the comprehensive development of the water resources of the Kansas River Basin. Testimony before the committee reveals that the State of Kansas has indicated an interest in having storage included in this reservoir under the provisions of the Water Supply Act of last year. The committee believes that this is a desirable and necessary step forward in the development and use of this valuable resource. The testimony of the division engineer indicates that he would be prepared to start construction at the present site without the water supply features. He pointed out, however, that if an agreement was consummated with the State of Kansas to provide water supply, it would involve construction at a new site and that he doubted whether construction would be initiated in fiscal year 1960.

In order that consideration may be given to the full utilization of the site, the committee has not recommended construction funds for the Milford project this year.

JOANNA DAM, MO.

The committee has not restored the budget estimate of \$60,000 for planning on this project which was deleted by the House, since the full \$50,000 appropriated for planning on this project in fiscal year 1959 will be unused and available in fiscal year 1960.

ALLEGHENY RIVER RESERVOIR, PA.

The House committee in its report stated that it "has ordered an independent investigation of the merits of the alternative proposals advocated by the Corps of Engineers and the engineering consultants for the Seneca Indians for development of flood control storage in the upper Allegheny River area. In view of this fact and the further fact that litigation on the matter of the Kinzua Dam is still pending in the Supreme Court, the committee directs that the \$1.4 million balance of previously appropriated funds available for the project be reprogramed to other projects."

During the consideration of the bill in the House the following amendment was adopted:

Provided further, That \$1,400,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be available for the Allegheny River Reservoir to be available after the disposition of the pending legal action of the Seneca Indians and the completion of the engineering studies ordered by the Appropriations Committee and the approval of the Appropriations Committee.

It should be noted that the language in the bill as passed the House purports to appropriate \$1.4 million for the Allegheny River Reservoir; however, no increase was made in the overall appropriation, this language, therefore, would have the effect of reducing appropriations for other projects by \$1.4 million.

The Senate committee feels that the alternate Conewango Valley proposals have been adequately considered and reviewed, both by the Corps of Engineers and independent consultants.

The original proposal of the engineering consultant to the Seneca Indians was reviewed by the Corps of Engineers. They found that, while the plan was engineeringly feasible, the cost would be considerably in excess of the authorized Allegheny River Reservoir. Subsequently, the engineering consultant for the Indians suggested additional alternate plans. The Corps of Engineers then engaged a well-known and competent firm of consulting engineers to make an independent analysis of the alternate proposals. The findings of this independent investigation of the merits of the five alternate proposals revealed that the schemes presented were engineeringly sound but that all of them would be more costly than the authorized project.

This year during the hearings the opponents of the Allegheny River Reservoir presented a sixth alternate plan. This plan has also been studied by the Corps of Engineers and personally reviewed by the Chief of Engineers. The Chief of Engineers finds that plan 6 does not provide a solution to the water resource development problems of the Allegheny River Basin that compares favorably with the authorized plan.

It is interesting to note that during the hearings the attorney for the Indians stated that if the Supreme Court denied his writ of certiorari, he was through legally but not engineeringly, and the engineer

for the Indians stated that the possibilities in the Conewango Valley are unlimited. It would appear, therefore, that if an independent investigation was adverse to plan 6, next year the committee would be confronted with plan 7 or 8 for consideration.

The proponents of the Conewango Valley plan, deny that their plan provides for the diversion of excess floodwaters into Lake Erie; they claim that it would only be the unwanted waters. At any rate the alternate plan provides a channel having a capacity of 60,000 cubic feet per second. The committee is of the opinion that the State of Pennsylvania would officially oppose any plan that provided for the diversion of Allegheny River waters into Lake Erie. Certainly any plan for the diversion of the Allegheny River waters into Lake Erie would come under the cognizance of the International Joint Commission, as well as the States bordering Lake Erie. The committee has received protests from the Conewango Valley Flood Control Association, Inc. That association points out that the Conewango watershed is a valuable agricultural area. That one-third of the 190,000-acre watershed is highly productive bottomland, and the hills are excellent for livestock production. The association further points out that over the past several years a workplan for the protection and improvement of the valley has been prepared under the provisions of Public Law 566.

The Allegheny River Reservoir was authorized more than 20 years ago. The committee believes that reservoir control in this area is urgently needed to reduce flood damage in the industrial and residential areas of Warren, Oil City, Franklin, and downstream areas. It has confidence in the ability and integrity of the Corps of Engineers, who will have the ultimate responsibility of constructing the project.

Subsequent to the House action the Supreme Court on June 15 denied the petition for certiorari, which removes the last legal obstacle to the construction of the Allegheny River Reservoir.

The committee has therefore recommended the appropriation of \$1.4 million, which is in conformity with the House action, but has deleted the contingent portion of the House amendment, namely:

to be available after the disposition of the pending legal action of the Seneca Indians and the completion of the engineering studies ordered by the Appropriations Committee and the approval of the Appropriations Committee.

FORT RANDALL RESERVOIR, S. DAK.

The committee desires that the Corps of Engineers make a study of the bank erosion problem at the St. Joseph Indian School in the vicinity of Chamberlain, S. Dak., caused by the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir, and report back to the committee at the earliest date the most feasible method of protecting this area, and the cost of such protective work.

CHRISTIANSTED HARBOR, V.I.

As a result of funds appropriated a few years ago for a restudy of this project, the Corps of Engineers determined that the benefit-to-cost ratio was 0.6 to 1.0 and the project has been reclassified as inactive. Local interests have engaged a firm of consulting engineers who have indicated that a project of lesser scope would be economically justified. The committee therefore recommends an appropri-

tion of \$3,000 to enable the Corps of Engineers to explore this possibility.

COORDINATION STUDIES WITH THE FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

In the past, the Corps of Engineers have transferred funds from their planning and construction allocations to the Fish and Wildlife Service for studies to determine the effect on fish and wildlife habitats resulting from the construction of the project and means to minimize damages or to provide positive wildlife benefits from the authorized project.

This year the Budget contemplated a direct appropriation to the Fish and Wildlife Service in the Interior Department appropriation bill.

Funds for this purpose were denied; however, the statement of the managers on the part of the House in the conference report recognized the need for a direct appropriation for this purpose in the public works appropriation bill. In conformity with the understanding reached in that conference report, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$500,000 for this purpose and has included the following language in the bill:

Provided, That \$500,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563-565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Department of the Army.

REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGES

The budget estimate proposed a general reduction of \$30 million for anticipated savings and slippages in the construction program. The House has increased this figure to \$43 million and has therefore reduced the total new money request by \$13 million. Since actual slippages and savings have already been reported to the House and Senate committees and the House has taken full advantage of these savings and slippages in their action on the bill, the committee has recommended the budget estimate, a general reduction of \$30 million, for this purpose.

LOWER COLUMBIA RIVER FISHERIES DEVELOPMENT

During the past few years the committee has noted a lack of interest on someone's part, in considering the fishery problem on the Middle Snake River. As a result of the insistence of this committee, and the earmarking of funds in the committee report, the amount of \$625,000 has been allotted to Idaho since 1957, of which \$125,000 had been expended to February 24, 1959.

The budget estimate of \$1,200,000 for fiscal year 1960 includes only \$25,000 for the State of Idaho.

At the time of the hearings in March of this year, the Fish and Wildlife Service had not yet determined how many hatcheries would be required in Idaho, or the location of even the first one.

Considering the importance of Idaho streams to the fishery resource of the Pacific Northwest, the committee is at a loss to understand the

reluctance of those responsible for this resource to expend the funds provided for this purpose in Idaho.

In view of the large unexpended balance currently available for the fishery development program in Idaho the committee is reluctant to earmark additional funds for this purpose in fiscal year 1960. It expects however that the State and Federal agencies responsible for this program will develop plans for needed hatcheries during the current fiscal year, and be prepared to move forward at a realistic rate in fiscal year 1960. The committee desires, however, that the funds previously earmarked for Idaho not be used in any other State during fiscal year 1960.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriation, 1959.....	\$114,521,100
Budget estimate, 1960.....	113,500,000
House allowance.....	114,382,000
Committee recommendation.....	122,382,000

The committee concurred in the increases approved by the House for maintenance items.

The committee desires that the corps continue to operate Dismal Swamp Canal throughout fiscal year 1960.

The details of the committee's recommendations are shown on the following table:

Operation and maintenance

Item (1)	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1960 (2)	House allowance (3)	Senate committee recommendation (4)
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL			
1. Navigation:			
(a) Channels and harbors.....	\$54,600,000	\$55,440,000	\$55,440,000
(b) Locks, dams, and canals.....	23,650,000	23,692,000	23,692,000
(c) Surveys of northern and northwestern lakes.....	550,000	550,000	550,000
(d) Prevention of obstructions and injurious deposits.....	600,000	600,000	600,000
2. Flood control:			
(a) Reservoirs.....	5,170,000	5,170,000	5,170,000
(b) Other (including channel improvement projects, miscellaneous maintenance items, and inspections).....	830,000	830,000	830,000
3. Multiple purpose projects including power.....	18,780,000	18,780,000	18,780,000
4. Lower Columbia River fish sanctuary program (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service).....	1,750,000	1,750,000	1,750,000
5. Niagara remedial works.....	70,000	70,000	70,000
6. Emergency operations:			
(a) Removing sunken vessels and other obstructions to navigation.....	450,000	450,000	450,000
(b) Protecting, clearing, straightening channels of navigable waters not specifically authorized by Congress (work under sec. 3, River and Harbor Act, Mar. 2, 1945).....	50,000	50,000	50,000
(c) Flood control emergencies, repair and flood fighting and rescue work.....	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
7. Deferred maintenance.....			8,000,000
Total, operation and maintenance, general.....	113,500,000	114,382,000	122,382,000

DEFERRED MAINTENANCE

Four years ago, this committee, after receiving extensive testimony on the status of maintenance at Corps of Engineer projects recommended a program for the reduction of the backlog over a period of 6 to 7 years. Four years ago the corps estimated the backlog at \$65 million. In the past 3 years the Congress has provided a total of

\$27,400,000 for the reduction of this backlog. Each year until the current hearings the committee was led to believe that we were reducing the backlog by the amount of the appropriations made, except for one division engineer last year that admitted that due to wage board increases he was actually getting further behind in his maintenance.

This year the committee was shocked to learn that instead of having reduced the backlog of deferred maintenance to \$37,600,000, the Corps had revised the definition of deferred maintenance and that the backlog is now \$90,000,000.

While the committee appreciates the position of the officers in supporting the budget request, and realizes that sometimes they have to resort to such doubletalk as "the budget estimate provides for the minimum essential maintenance" when as a matter of degree and judgment they may not feel that they have adequate funds for minimum essential maintenance. It is quite another matter however, when they are asked a direct question, "Will the amount in the budget be adequate to keep your maintenance current and not increase your backlog?"

The committee feels that it is entitled to honest and straightforward answers to direct questions. The committee must conclude that the answers to their questions in the past few years in this regard have been less than frank.

The committee notes that the justification submitted for maintenance is totally inadequate. Unless and until an adequate base program is established, and adjusted annually to take into account new projects added to the maintenance workload, it will be impossible to cope with the backlog of deferred maintenance.

The committee is convinced that there is a large backlog of maintenance that should be accomplished. It is not convinced that the corps has an adequate or valid estimate of that backlog. This subject is of sufficient importance to warrant further study.

The committee notes that part of this backlog relates to structures such as breakwaters, locks and dams, etc., where continued physical deterioration can further increase the cost of repair or rehabilitation. Part of the increases in the deferred maintenance is the result of ice or storm damage that has occurred subsequent to the original estimate, and the committee was not kept currently informed of these increases in the deferred maintenance.

In connection with the further study of this problem which the committee is recommending, it is believed that it would be desirable to separate the backlog by categories. In that way the committee can give priority consideration to the most urgent categories.

In recommending an increase of \$8 million for the reduction of the backlog of maintenance, so as to provide a total of \$10 million for this purpose, the committee desires to point out that this action is taken in recognition of the urgency of the work, rather than the record made by the corps.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1959.....	\$12, 738, 700
Budget estimate, 1960.....	12, 640, 000
House allowance.....	12, 640, 000
Committee recommendation.....	12, 640, 000

The committee recommends \$12,640,000, the budget estimate and the amount allowed by the House.

General expenses, fiscal year 1960

Item	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1960	House allowance	Senate committee recommendation
GENERAL EXPENSES			
1. Executive direction and management:			
(a) Office, Chief of Engineers.....	\$4,035,000	\$4,035,000	\$4,035,000
(b) Division offices.....	6,267,000	6,267,000	6,267,000
Subtotal, executive direction and management....	10,302,000	10,302,000	10,302,000
2. Review boards:			
(a) River and Harbor Board.....	473,000	473,000	473,000
(b) Beach Erosion Board.....	148,000	148,000	148,000
Subtotal, review boards.....	621,000	621,000	621,000
3. Regulation:			
(a) Regulation of hydraulic mining on Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers (California Debris Commission).....	5,000	5,000	5,000
(b) Prevention of illegal deposits in New York Harbor.			
(c) Miscellaneous inspections, issuance of permits, harbor lines, etc.....	697,000	697,000	697,000
Subtotal, regulation.....	702,000	702,000	702,000
4. Commercial statistics.....	874,000	874,000	874,000
5. Special investigations.....	141,000	141,000	141,000
Total, general expense.....	12,640,000	12,640,000	12,640,000

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

Appropriation, 1959.....	\$68,347,500
Budget estimate, 1960.....	68,000,000
House allowance.....	68,560,000
Committee recommendation.....	75,434,500

The committee concurs in the increases allowed by the House.

The additional funds recommended in the St. Francis Basin include \$280,000 to initiate construction of two additional levee items in the lower reach of the St. Francis River; \$113,000 to initiate construction on the Mayo ditch enlargement; and \$177,000 to complete the Big Lake floodway ditches below Pettyville, Ark., a part of the Little River drainage.

The \$107,000 recommended for planning in the Lower White River Basin is for the preparation of plans and specifications for the pump-out plant to dispose of interior drainage during flood periods.

Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, fiscal year 1960

Projects (1)	Total estimated Federal cost (2)	Amount appropriated to date (3)	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1960		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
			Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
1. General investigations:								
(a) Examinations and surveys.....		\$1,761,300	\$60,000		\$60,000		\$67,500	
(b) Collection and study of basic data.....		240,000	50,000		50,000		50,000	
Subtotal, general investigations.....		2,001,300	110,000		110,000		117,500	
2. Construction and planning:								
Mississippi River levees ¹	\$221,000,000	194,308,000	\$2,500,000		\$2,500,000		\$3,000,000	
Channel improvement.....	468,000,000	392,281,000	22,500,000		22,500,000		25,000,000	
Section 6 levees.....	3,784,600	3,428,600	0					
Memphis Harbor.....	18,000,000	13,752,000	500,000		500,000		500,000	
Greenville Harbor.....	2,490,000		0			60,000		60,000
Vicksburg Harbor.....	4,520,000	1,960,000	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
Baton Rouge Harbor.....	2,800,000	785,000	0					
Old River control.....	80,000,000	30,257,000	9,500,000		9,500,000		9,500,000	
St. Francis Basin.....	84,400,000	33,427,000	3,500,000		3,500,000		4,070,000	
Lower White River ²	12,900,000	9,453,700	0					107,000
Reelfoot Lake.....	652,000	537,500	0					
Cache Basin.....	24,200,000	0	0					
L'Anguille Basin.....	5,600,000	0	0					
West Tennessee tributaries.....	8,400,000	170,000	0		200,000		200,000	
Wolf River and tributaries.....	2,025,000	43,000	0		300,000		300,000	
Grand Prairie-Bayou Meto.....	33,300,000	0	0					
Lower Arkansas.....	25,800,000	19,369,000	550,000		550,000		550,000	
Tensas Basin:								
Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, etc. ²	21,700,000	15,414,000	920,000		920,000		1,000,000	
Red River backwater.....	8,200,000	7,939,000	80,000		80,000		80,000	
Yazoo Basin:								
Sardis Reservoir.....	11,980,000	11,696,200	50,000		50,000		50,000	
Enid Reservoir.....	15,220,000	15,021,600	50,000		50,000		50,000	
Arkabutla Reservoir.....	12,770,000	11,874,700	70,000		70,000		70,000	
Grenada Reservoir.....	31,430,000	31,275,300	30,000		30,000		30,000	
Greenwood.....	5,270,000	2,323,300	0					
Belzoni.....	319,000	319,000	0					
Yazoo City.....	2,210,000	2,209,600	0					
Auxiliary channels.....	24,771,000	7,466,000	1,075,000		1,075,000		1,275,000	
Main stem.....	19,900,000	6,156,000	750,000		750,000		750,000	
Tributaries.....	27,600,000	5,467,500	125,000		125,000		125,000	
Big Sunflower River, etc.....	8,630,000	3,425,800	1,400,000		1,400,000		1,400,000	
Yazoo backwater.....	30,900,000	279,000	0				100,000	

See footnotes at end of table, p. 32.

Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, fiscal year 1960—Continued

32

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1960

Projects (1)	Total estimated Federal cost (2)	Amount appropriated to date (3)	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1960		House allowance		Committee recommendation	
			Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
2. Construction and planning—Continued								
Lower Red River.....	\$8,950,000	\$8,145,900	0	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Bayou Cocodrie and tributaries.....	4,290,000	3,377,800	0	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Atchafalaya Basin.....	119,000,000	94,852,000	\$5,290,000	-----	\$5,290,000	-----	\$6,900,000	-----
Amite River.....	70,000	0	0	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Lake Pontchartrain.....	6,190,000	3,267,000	500,000	-----	500,000	-----	700,000	-----
Completed work ¹	129,068,600	129,068,600	0	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, construction and planning.....	1,486,340,200	⁴ 1,059,350,100	50,890,000	-----	51,390,000	\$60,000	57,150,000	\$167,000
3. Maintenance.....	-----	-----	17,000,000	-----	17,000,000	-----	18,000,000	-----
4. Flood control emergencies.....	25,000,000	14,900,300	0	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Grand total.....	1,511,340,200	1,076,251,700	68,000,000	-----	\$68,560,000	-----	\$75,434,500	-----

¹Includes new Madrid floodgate.

² Modifications authorized by the act of July 3, 1958, are included in the cost estimates.

³ Costs of preauthorization studies (\$2,642,900) are included in the total estimated Federal cost. However, only those amounts totaling \$2,126,000 which are chargeable against project limitations are included in the amount appropriated to date. These amounts

were transferred to the individual projects from S.G. & O. previously included in the feature completed work.

⁴ Total includes \$344,400 in preauthorization studies not chargeable against project limitations.

U.S. SECTION, ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, JOINT BOARD OF ENGINEERS

Appropriation, 1959-----	\$100, 000
Budget estimate, 1960-----	40, 000
House allowance-----	40, 000
Committee recommendation-----	40, 000

The committee recommends the budget estimate of \$40,000 for necessary expenses of the U.S. Section of the St. Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers. The appropriation language provides for the reimbursement of the expenditures by the U.S. entity authorized to construct the power works in the International Rapids Section of the St. Lawrence River.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The committee considered budget estimates totaling \$289,211,000 for the activities and programs of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, and the Southwestern Power Administration. The committee recommends the allowance of appropriations totaling \$298,887,500 for these activities and programs. The sum recommended is—

An increase over the 1959 appropriations of \$298,060,985 by-----	\$826, 515
An increase over the budget estimates of \$289,211,000 by-----	9, 676, 500
An increase over the House allowances of \$288,756,500 by-----	10, 131, 000

The action of the committee on each appropriation is explained under the appropriate heading in this report.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriation, 1959-----	\$4, 556, 000
Budget estimate, 1960-----	5, 000, 000
House allowance-----	4, 349, 261
Committee recommendation-----	5, 390, 000

The committee recommends the allowance of an appropriation of \$5,390,000 for the general investigations program of the Bureau. The revised budget program set out on pages 162–166 of the Senate hearings has been approved, and funds are recommended for the following increases.

Gulf basins project, Texas, \$100,000.—The committee recommends the allowance of \$711,000 for this investigation. The sum recommended is an increase of \$100,000 over the sum requested in the budget. It is the view of the committee that this increase is required in order that the Bureau may coordinate its studies with those of the River Basin Study Commission for Texas, and furnish technical information required by the Commission.

Salt Fork and Prairie Dog Town Fork of the Red River, Tex., \$90,000.—The committee recommends the allowance of \$90,000 for the initiation of this investigation. This 2-year study, estimated to cost \$165,000, involves that portion of Texas drained by the Salt Fork and the Prairie Dog Town Fork of the Red River, which comprises all or part of 12 counties lying in an east-west strip across the Panhandle.

Fish and wildlife studies, \$200,000.—The committee recommends the allowance of \$200,000 for the financing of fish and wildlife studies required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 in

connection with proposed projects of the Bureau of Reclamation. Funds for this purpose were included in the budget estimate for the appropriation entitled, "Management and Investigation of Resources, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife." As the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill passed the House, funds for these studies were not included, and they were included in the bill as it passed the Senate. However, the funds were disallowed by the conference committee. In taking this action the "Statement of the Managers on the Part of the House in the Conference Report on the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill" stated:

Amendment No. 24. * * *. The conferees are in agreement that funds for river basin studies should continue to be transferred from appropriations of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. However, the conferees recommend that the appropriations involved hereafter contain specific language indicating the amount to be transferred to the Fish and Wildlife Service. It is recognized that these agencies will require additional funds to finance these studies.

In accordance with the above quoted statement the committee recommends the allowance of \$200,000 for these studies, with a provision in the bill transferring this sum to the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Middle Gila River project, Arizona.—Within the funds recommended \$57,600 shall be available for the continuation of the Middle Gila River investigation. This sum is an increase of \$40,000 over the budget program and will allow the Bureau to restudy railroad relocation problem in the Buttes Dam and Reservoir site.

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

	Program	Appropriation
Appropriation, 1959.....		\$146,015,000
Budget estimate, 1960.....	\$141,410,000	135,410,000
House allowance.....	138,989,000	128,473,239
Committee recommendation.....	149,811,000	142,346,000

The committee recommends the allowance of an appropriation of \$142,346,000 to finance a construction program of \$149,811,000. As has been the practice over a number of years the committee has approved a program in excess of the funds recommended. Experience has proven this to be a workable procedure. The program submitted in the budget was based on an underfinancing of \$6,000,000; the House program is based on an underfinancing of \$10,515,761; and the program recommended by the committee is underfinanced by \$7,465,000—approximately 5 percent.

The program recommended by the committee is set out in the following tabulation:

State and project	Budget program	House program	Recom- mended program
Arizona:			
Gila project.....	\$1, 139, 000	\$1, 139, 000	\$3, 449, 000
Colorado River front work and levee system.....			450, 000
Parker-Davis project.....	400, 000	400, 000	400, 000
Boulder Canyon project.....	2, 900, 000	2, 900, 000	2, 900, 000
California:			
Central Valley project.....	42, 500, 000	42, 150, 000	44, 565, 000
Klamath project. (See Oregon.)			
Parker-Davis project. (See Arizona.)			
Solano project.....	307, 000	307, 000	307, 000
Ventura River project.....	392, 000	392, 000	392, 000
Washoe project. (See Nevada.)			
Colorado: Colbran project.....	4, 500, 000	4, 500, 000	4, 500, 000
Idaho:			
Little Wood River project.....	673, 618	673, 618	673, 618
Minicooka project, north side pump division.....	850, 000	850, 000	850, 000
Palisades project, Burns Creek Dam and powerplant.....			500, 000
Montana: Fort Peck project.....	2, 902, 000	2, 902, 000	2, 902, 000
Nevada:			
Boulder Canyon project. (See Arizona.)			
Parker-Davis project. (See Arizona.)			
Washoe project.....	1, 600, 000		1, 000, 000
New Mexico:			
McMillan Delta project.....	100, 000	100, 000	100, 000
Middle Rio Grande project.....	1, 400, 000	1, 400, 000	1, 800, 000
North Dakota: Fort Peck project. (See Montana.)			
Oklahoma: Washita Basin project.....	10, 100, 000	10, 100, 000	10, 100, 000
Oregon:			
Crooked River project.....	2, 833, 000	2, 833, 000	2, 833, 000
Klamath project.....	522, 000	522, 000	522, 000
Rogue River Basin project, Talent division.....	2, 747, 788	2, 747, 788	2, 747, 788
Wapinitia project, Juniper division.....	39, 700	39, 700	39, 700
Texas:			
Lower Rio Grande project, Mercedes division.....	1, 500, 000	1, 500, 000	1, 500, 000
San Angelo project.....	4, 000, 000	4, 000, 000	4, 000, 000
Utah:			
Provo River project.....	632, 000	632, 000	632, 000
Weber Basin project.....	5, 835, 000	5, 835, 000	5, 835, 000
Washington:			
Columbia Basin project.....	8, 000, 000	8, 000, 000	8, 000, 000
Chief Joseph Dam, Greater Wenatchee division.....		724, 000	500, 000
Wyoming: Shoshone project.....	110, 000	110, 000	110, 000
Drainage and minor construction.....	937, 000	937, 000	962, 000
Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects.....	3, 500, 000	3, 500, 000	3, 500, 000
Subtotal (exclusive of Missouri River Basin).....	100, 420, 106	99, 194, 106	106, 070, 106
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT			
Kansas:			
Bostwick division. (See Nebraska.)		700, 000	400, 000
Cedar Bluff unit.....		3, 115, 000	3, 115, 000
Webster unit.....	3, 115, 000		
Montana:			
East Bench unit.....		1, 000, 000	
Helena Valley unit.....	2, 182, 000	2, 182, 000	2, 182, 000
Yellowtail Dam (Hardin unit).....			3, 000, 000
Nebraska:			
Ainsworth unit.....	2, 000, 000		1, 000, 000
Bostwick division.....	2, 338, 000	2, 338, 000	2, 338, 000
Farwell unit.....	3, 000, 000	3, 000, 000	3, 000, 000
Frenchman-Cambridge division.....	4, 076, 035	4, 601, 035	4, 601, 035
Red Willow Dam and Reservoir (included in Frenchman-Cambridge division).....		(525, 000)	(525, 000)
Wyoming:			
Glendo unit.....	2, 118, 000	2, 118, 000	2, 118, 000
Owl Creek unit.....	1, 007, 859	1, 007, 859	1, 007, 859
Transmission division.....	15, 508, 000	14, 953, 000	15, 334, 000
Drainage and minor construction.....	645, 000	645, 000	645, 000
Investigations.....	2, 000, 000	1, 750, 000	2, 000, 000
Other Department of the Interior agencies.....	3, 000, 000	2, 385, 000	3, 000, 000
Subtotal, Missouri River Basin project.....	40, 989, 894	39, 794, 894	43, 740, 894
Grand total, construction and rehabilitation.....	141, 410, 000	138, 989, 000	149, 811, 000
Less underfinancing.....	6, 000, 000	10, 515, 761	7, 465, 000
Total appropriation.....	135, 410, 000	128, 473, 239	142, 346, 000

Gila project, Arizona.—The committee recommends a program of \$3,449,000, an increase of \$2,310,000 over the budget program, which was approved by the House. The increase recommended by the committee is for the initiation of construction of drainage facilities for the lands of the Wellton-Mohawk district. The committee was advised that the drainage problems of this district are of an emergency nature; therefore, the committee has recommended funds to initiate these facilities in fiscal year 1960. However, no part of the increase recommended is to be obligated until the district has executed a repayment contract to cover the additional cost of the required drainage facilities and such contract has been validated as required by the laws of the State of Arizona.

Colorado River front work and levee system.—The committee recommends \$450,000 to initiate construction of drainage facilities from the western boundary of the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation District to the Colorado River. Such facilities were authorized by Public Law 85-389, which was an amendment to the Colorado River Front Work and Levee System Act. These facilities are required to carry drainage water from Federal reclamation projects in this area to the Colorado River.

Central Valley project, California—Keswick-Toyon transmission line.—The committee recommends concurrence in the House action of disallowing \$350,000 requested for the Keswick-Toyon transmission line. The committee was advised by the Bureau that a wheeling agreement has been entered into with the utility company serving the area whereby the customers to be served by the proposed line will be served through the facilities of the utility company.

Trinity power facilities.—The committee recommends the allowance of \$2,415,000 for the engineering and design and construction of the power facilities at the Trinity Dam.

Palisades Project-Burns Creek Dam and powerplant, Idaho.—Funds in the amount of \$500,000 were provided for this project in 1959, contingent upon the enactment of legislation authorizing the project. Such legislation was not enacted during the 85th Congress. However, there is legislation pending in this Congress to authorize the project. Therefore, the committee recommends a program of \$500,000 for this project, which shall not be available until the project is authorized.

Middle Rio Grande project, New Mexico.—The committee recommends a program of \$1,800,000 for the Middle Rio Grande project. The increase of \$400,000 over the budget program is to allow the Bureau of Reclamation to proceed with channel rectification work in that stretch of the river where the Corps of Engineers will be proceeding with work on the floodway with the sum of \$800,000 recommended for this purpose.

Washoe project, Nevada.—The committee recommends a program of \$1,000,000 for the continuation of this project. The House disallowed the full budget program of \$1,600,000. The funds recommended are for the Prosser Creek Dam, which is a separately justifiable feature of the Washoe project. It is the view of the committee that construction should proceed as scheduled on this feature of the project.

Columbia Basin project, Washington.—In recommending the allowance of the budget program of \$8,000,000 for this project the committee has approved of the distribution of funds to the various features and divisions of the project as set out in the justifications submitted in support of the budget request.

Greater Wenatchee project, Washington.—The committee recommends a program of \$500,000 for the initiation of construction of the Greater Wenatchee Division of the Chief Joseph Dam project in Washington. The program recommended is a reduction of \$224,000 below the House-approved program for this project. The committee was advised by officials of the Bureau that the sum of \$500,000 was adequate for the first year of construction. This project, which is located in the Columbia River Valley in north-central Washington, will provide full irrigation water supply to 6,700 acres of land. The total estimated cost of the project is \$7,579,000, of which \$7,489,000 is reimbursable.

Drainage and minor construction.—The committee recommends a program of \$962,000 for the drainage and minor construction program. The increase of \$25,000 over the budget program of \$937,000 is for the construction of safety and public use facilities at the Alamogordo Dam (Carlsbad project) in New Mexico. The committee also recommends the inclusion of a provision in the bill to provide that these funds shall be nonreimbursable.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Initiation of construction of new units.—In recommending funds for the initiation of construction of new irrigation projects in the Missouri River Basin the committee has taken into consideration the repeated assurance of officials of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, and the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee that there is adequate water in the Missouri River system to carry out all of the multiple-purpose water uses authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944.

Cedar Bluff unit, Kansas.—The committee recommends a program of \$400,000 to initiate construction of the irrigation features of the Cedar Bluff unit in Kansas. The program recommended is a reduction of \$300,000 in the program approved by the House. The committee was advised by officials of the Bureau that the sum recommended is adequate for the first year of construction.

This unit, which is located in west central Kansas along the Smoky Hill River, consists of the existing Cedar Bluff Dam and Reservoir and the proposed canal lateral and drainage systems to serve a full irrigation water supply to 6,200 acres of land. Municipal and industrial water will be furnished to Russell, Kans., and water will also be furnished to the Federal Fish Cultural Station now under construction. The total estimated cost of the irrigation features is \$4,440,600, all of which is reimbursable.

East Bench unit, Montana.—The committee recommends that funds allowed by the House for initiation of construction of the East Bench unit in Montana be disallowed. This action of the committee is taken without prejudice to this unit, but inasmuch as the committee has recommended funds for the initiation of construction of the Yellowtail unit in Montana at a total estimated cost of \$109,300,000, it did not feel that it could also recommend initiation of construction of this unit, the total cost of which is in excess of \$20 million.

Yellowtail unit, Montana.—The committee recommends a program of \$3,000,000 for the initiation of construction of the Yellowtail unit in Montana. This unit, which is located on the Big Horn River some 40 miles south of Hardin, Mont., will produce 200,000 kilowatts of power and provide flood control, fish and wildlife and recreation benefits. The total estimated cost of the power features of the unit is \$66,076,000, all of which will be reimbursed from power revenues.

Ainsworth unit, Nebraska.—The committee recommends a program of \$1,000,000 for the continuation of construction of this unit. The House disallowed the program of \$2,000,000 requested in the budget. The committee was advised that it is likely that the pending litigation concerning this unit will be resolved during the fall term of the Nebraska Supreme Court.

Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska.—The committee recommends concurrence in the House program of \$4,601,035 for this division. The increase of \$525,000 over the budget program is for the initiation of construction of the Red Willow Dam and Reservoir and related irrigation facilities. This facility, the total estimated cost of which is \$6,597,000, will provide a water supply for 7,650 acres of land, as well as flood control, fish and wildlife and recreation benefits.

Transmission division.—The committee recommends a program of \$15,334,000 for the transmission division of the Missouri River Basin project. The program submitted in the justifications in support of the budget program has been approved with the following modifications:

Fort Thompson-Granite Falls transmission line.—The committee recommends concurrence in the House action disallowing \$1,078,000 programmed for the second circuit of this line. The committee was advised by officials of the Bureau that this item could be deferred.

Fort Randall-Nebraska State line transmission facility.—The committee recommends a program of \$104,000 for the construction of 5 miles of transmission line from the Gavins Point switchyard to the Nebraska State line to connect with the transmission facilities being constructed by the Nebraska Power System. It is the view of the committee that funds should be provided for this facility in order that the Nebraska Power System will not be required to construct facilities outside of the State of Nebraska.

Transmission facilities to serve preference customers in western Iowa.—The committee recommends concurrence in the House program of \$800,000 for the design and initiation of construction of transmission facilities to serve preference customers in western Iowa. The total estimated cost of these facilities is \$8,800,000.

Investigations.—In recommending the budget program of \$2,000,000 for Missouri River Basin investigations the committee has approved the revised investigations program set out on pages 424-425 of the Senate hearings.

Other Department of the Interior agencies.—In recommending the budget program of \$3,000,000 for the activities of the other Department of Interior agencies in the Missouri River Basin project the committee has taken into consideration the fact that the programs of these agencies are related to the programs of the Corps of Engineers as well as the programs of the Bureau of Reclamation and for planning of the comprehensive development of the Missouri Basin.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1959.....	\$28,331,000
Budget estimate, 1960.....	29,131,000
House allowance.....	29,131,000
Committee recommendation.....	29,131,000

The committee recommends concurrence in the House allowance of the budget estimate of \$29,131,000 for the operation and maintenance expenses of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The funds recommended and approximately \$4,000,000 advanced by water users provide for the operation and maintenance of facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation. In fiscal year 1960 a total of 41 projects and 23 Missouri River Basin units and divisions will be operated and maintained for irrigation, power, municipal and industrial water supplies, of which 20 projects and 5 Missouri River Basin units have power facilities.

Of the sum recommended \$25,972,013 will be reimbursed to the Treasury from charges assessed against the water users for irrigation water, charges for municipal and industrial water, and from power revenues.

LOAN PROGRAM

Appropriation, 1959.....	\$14,497,000
Budget estimate, 1960.....	220,000
House allowance.....	7,237,000
Committee recommendation.....	6,236,500

The committee recommends the allowance of \$6,236,500 for the loan program of the Bureau. These funds finance loans to irrigation districts for the construction of distribution systems under the provisions of the act of July 4, 1955 (Public Law 130, 84th Cong.), and for the construction of small projects under the provisions of the act of August 6, 1956 (Public Law 984, 84th Cong.).

The House allowance of \$7,237,000 provides for the full amount of the loans for the Chowchilla Water District (\$2,633,000) and the Saucelito Irrigation District (\$4,384,000) and the budget estimate of \$220,000 for the administration of the program.

Since the House passed the bill additional loans totaling \$10,172,500 have met all requirements of the authorizing acts. Inasmuch as the President's budget does not include any funds for these loans the committee did not feel that it could recommend the full requirement of over \$17,000,000 for this program. However, the committee feels that the projects involved should proceed in fiscal year 1960. Therefore, the committee recommends the allowance of an appropriation of \$6,236,500 which is the 1960 requirements for all the loans that have complied with the provisions of the authorizing acts.

The loans approved by the committee and for which the requirements for fiscal 1960 are recommended are set out in the following tabulation:

Organization	Loan	Total appropriation requirement	Fiscal year requirement if financed on annual basis		
			Fiscal year 1960	Fiscal year 1961	Fiscal year 1962
Public Law 130, requirement completed:					
Chowchilla Water District, California	\$2,650,000	\$2,633,000	\$910,000	\$1,723,000	0
Saucelito Irrigation District, California	4,650,000	4,384,000	1,350,000	3,009,000	\$25,000
Public Law 984, 60-day requirement completed:					
Santa Ynez River Water Conservation District, California	3,800,000	3,774,000	1,320,000	2,454,000	0
Centerville-Deuel Creek Irrigation Co., Utah	402,000	399,500	399,500	0	0
Public Law 984, 60 days in process:					
Pleasant Valley County Water District, California	2,040,000	2,032,000	390,000	1,642,000	0
Georgetown Divide Public Utility District, California	3,878,000	3,867,000	1,647,000	2,220,000	0
Total requirements		17,089,500	6,016,500	11,048,000	25,000

The committee recommends the inclusion of a provision in the bill to authorize the Secretary to enter into contracts "contingent on appropriations" with respect to loans for the construction of distribution systems under the provisions of the act of July 4, 1955 (Public Law 130, 84th Cong.).

The committee regrets that it is necessary to finance this program on an annual basis as it feels that some advantages of the program will be lost by such a procedure. It is the hope of the committee that the budget for fiscal year 1961 will recommend adequate funds to completely finance the loans approved by the committee and to finance in total any future loans under these acts.

In addition to the sum of \$6,016,500 for the loans the committee recommends the allowance of the \$220,000 requested in the budget for the administration of the program.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1959	\$4,381,600
Budget estimate, 1960	4,400,000
House allowance	4,400,000
Committee recommendation	4,400,000

The committee recommends concurrence in the House allowance of the budget estimate of \$4,400,000 for the general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Reclamation. These funds provide for the programs of the Commissioner's Office in Washington, the Assistant Commissioner and Chief Engineer's Office in Denver, and the seven regional offices. Other administrative costs directly chargeable to specific projects or activities are included in the appropriations for such projects and activities.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND

	Program	Appropriation
Appropriation, 1959.....		\$68,033,335
Budget estimate, 1960.....	\$77,035,000	77,035,000
House allowance.....	79,819,000	79,819,000
Committee recommendation.....	80,389,000	76,369,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$76,369,000 to finance a program of \$80,389,000 for the construction of the Colorado River storage project and the various participating projects. As in the case of the "Construction and rehabilitation" appropriation the committee has underfinanced this program by 5 percent. Experience has proven this to be a workable procedure, and it has been used for a number of years with respect to the construction program financed from the "Construction and rehabilitation" appropriation.

The program approved by the committee is set out in the following tabulation:

State and project	Budget program	House program	Recommended program
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT			
Arizona: Glen Canyon unit.....	\$47,367,000	\$47,367,000	\$47,367,000
Colorado: Curecanti.....			1,000,000
New Mexico: Navajo unit.....	9,945,000	9,945,000	9,945,000
Utah: Flaming Gorge unit.....	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
Transmission division.....	720,000	720,000	720,000
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS			
Colorado:			
Paonia project.....	3,185,000	3,185,000	3,185,000
Smith Fork project.....		730,000	500,000
New Mexico: Hammond project.....		500,000	500,000
Utah: Central Utah project, Vernal unit.....	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Wyoming: Seedskaadee project.....		1,554,000	1,354,000
Advance planning.....	818,000	818,000	818,000
Total program.....	77,035,000	79,819,000	80,389,000
Less: 5 percent underfinancing.....			4,020,000
Appropriation.....	77,035,000	79,819,000	76,369,000

Curecanti project, Colorado.—The committee recommends a program of \$1 million for the initiation of construction of the Curecanti project, which is located on the Gunnison River in west-central Colorado. No part of the funds recommended for this project are to be obligated until the certification requirement of the authorizing act (Colorado River Storage Project Act, 70 Stat. 105) has been complied with.

The Smith Fork project, Colorado.—The committee recommends a program of \$500,000 for the initiation of construction of the Smith Fork project in Colorado, a reduction of \$230,000 in the House program for this project. The committee was advised by officials of the Bureau that the program recommended is adequate for the first year of construction. The project will provide a full irrigation water supply to 1,320 acres of land and supplemental water to an additional 6,920 acres. The total estimated cost of the project is \$4,420,000, of which \$4,122,000 is reimbursable.

Hammond project, New Mexico.—The committee recommends concurrence in the House program of \$500,000 for the initiation of construction of the Hammond project in New Mexico. This project, the total estimated cost of which is \$3,280,000, will provide a full irrigation water supply for 3,900 acres of land. Of the total estimated cost, \$3,174,000, is reimbursable.

Seedskadee project, Wyoming.—The committee recommends a program of \$1,354,000 for the initiation of construction of the Seedskadee project in Wyoming, a reduction of \$200,000 in the program approved by the House for this project. The committee was advised by officials of the Bureau that the sum recommended is adequate for the first year of construction. This project is located on the Green River in southeastern Wyoming and will provide a full irrigation water supply to 59,620 acres of land, along with recreational and fish and wildlife benefits. Of the total estimated cost of \$37,885,000, \$35,449,000 is reimbursable.

Transmission division.—The committee expects the Bureau to confer with representatives of the preference customers and the utilities serving the Upper Colorado River Basin area in the planning of the transmission system to market Colorado River storage project power. The committee was assured by the Commissioner of the Bureau that when the Bureau has completed its basic studies of the proposed transmission system, conferences with representatives of these groups will be scheduled.

Operating criteria.—Last year the committee expressed its concern over the lack of announced operating criteria for the Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge Reservoirs. The view of the committee on this matter has not changed. It is the committee's understanding that the studies by the engineers of the lower basin States and the Bureau of Reclamation engineers have been completed; and that the studies of the engineers of the upper basin States will be completed in the near future. In view of the importance of this matter to the States of the upper and lower basin the committee expects the Secretary to announce operating criteria for these reservoirs by January 1, 1960.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The committee recommends concurrence in the House provision granting the authority to purchase 84 passenger vehicles for the replacement of vehicles that meet the standards for replacement (over 6 years old, or over 60,000 miles).

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1959.....	\$20,934,000
Budget estimate, 1960.....	25,000,000
House allowance.....	22,332,000
Committee recommendation.....	22,000,000

The committee recommends the allowance of an appropriation of \$22,000,000 for the construction program of the Bonneville Power Administration. The program submitted in the justifications in support of the budget estimate has been approved with the following modifications:

Cougar-Eugene transmission facility.—The committee recommends concurrence in the House allowance of \$143,000 for this facility. The sum recommended is a reduction of \$464,000 in the budget request of \$607,000 for this facility. The committee was advised that it was not essential to proceed with the original program for this facility due to delays in the completion schedule of additional generation facilities at Cougar Dam.

Goldendale tie.—The committee recommends that funds in the amount of \$265,000 in the budget estimate for this facility be disallowed. The committee was advised that this facility could be deferred, inasmuch as there has been a change in the plan to serve this area. Funds in the amount of \$317,000 made available for this facility in fiscal 1959 are to be applied to other facilities. The action of the committee with respect to this facility is in accord with the action of the House.

General system facilities.—The committee recommends the allowance of \$2,060,000 for general system facilities. The sum recommended is an increase of \$414,000 over the House allowance and a decrease of \$153,000 in the budget estimate.

The program approved by the committee totals \$24,118,000, which will be financed by the recommended appropriation of \$22,000,000, the application of \$317,000 of prior-year funds made available for the Goldendale tie facility and the use of \$1,801,000 of accumulated savings, resulting, in a large part, from recent savings in the purchases of steel.

Harney Electric Cooperative service.—The program recommended by the committee includes \$1,055,000 for the initiation of construction of facilities to provide service to the Harney Electric Cooperative. In disallowing funds for this facility the House committee stated in its report:

Justification for this line is contingent upon approval of a pending REA loan application for additional facilities for the co-op, and an increase in the very low load in the area.

The Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration announced on June 29, 1959, the approval of the application of the Harney Electric Cooperative for a loan of \$5,100,000 to expand the distribution system of the cooperative.

The committee recommends that Bonneville Power Administration provide for the future needs of the Klickitat County Public Utility District of Washington State, and the Wasco Electric Cooperative of Oregon for 115,000-volt service in capacities of approximately 100,000 kilowatts at John Day Dam. Both utilities have service areas and facilities adjacent to this project. The committee understands that the 115,000-volt service can be obtained by tap arrangements of the proposed 230,000-kilovolt transformers at the dam and that these two preference customers plan to construct their own transmission lines to this point of service.

The committee further recommends that Bonneville Power Administration reexamine its so-called at-site rate to ascertain whether the level of the rate and the conditions attached thereto are realistic. The committee is informed that the Administration's transmission costs are approximately \$7 per kilowatt. The at-site rate is \$14.50

per kilowatt-year. The regular postage stamp rate is \$17.50 per kilowatt-year. The differential between the two is less than Bonneville's transmission costs. The committee makes this recommendation because of complaints from communities near Federal dam sites in the Columbia River system to the effect that they experience a large influx of workers while a dam is under construction, with the attendant demands for local governmental services, and that once the dam is completed they have no way of attracting industry to fill the gap left in their economies because the at-site rate, as presently constituted, is not attractive. The committee requests Bonneville Power Administration to report to it on this subject prior to the time it considers fiscal 1961 appropriations.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1959.....	\$9,546,200
Budget estimate, 1960.....	10,250,000
House allowance.....	10,250,000
Committee recommendation.....	10,250,000

The committee recommends concurrence in the House allowance of \$10,250,000, the operation and maintenance expenses of the Bonneville Power Administration.

This program provides for the operation and maintenance of the Administration's high-voltage electric grid system, and for commercial and administrative expenses in marketing wholesale electric power from Federal dams in the Pacific Northwest.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1959.....	\$735,000
Budget estimate, 1960.....	735,000
House allowance.....	735,000
Committee recommendation.....	735,000

The committee recommends concurrence in the House allowance of \$735,000 for the operation and maintenance expenses of the Southeastern Power Administration.

This agency markets Federal hydroelectric power from 14 Corps of Engineers projects in a 10-State area of the Southeast through the transmission facilities of non-Federal agencies.

CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1959.....	None
Budget estimate, 1960.....	\$880,000
House allowance.....	880,000
Committee recommendation.....	880,000

The committee recommends concurrence in the House allowance of the budget estimate of \$880,000 for the construction program of the Southwestern Power Administration. These funds are required for the installation of additional transformer capacity at two substations and for supplies and equipment required in the operation and maintenance of the Administration's transmission system.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1959-----	\$1, 031, 250
Budget estimate, 1960-----	1, 150, 000
House allowance-----	1, 150, 000
Committee recommendation-----	1, 150, 000

The committee recommends concurrence in the House allowance of the budget estimate of \$1,150,000 for the operation and maintenance expenses of the Southwestern Power Administration.

This program provides for the operation and maintenance of the Administration's transmission system consisting of over 1,100 miles of transmission lines and 14 substations and for the expenses of marketing power developed at Corps of Engineer dams in four of the Southwestern States.

CONTINUING FUND

(Limitation on the use of receipts)

Limitation, 1959-----	\$4, 405, 000
Budget estimate, 1960-----	5, 000, 000
House allowance-----	5, 000, 000
Committee recommendation-----	5, 000, 000

The committee recommends concurrence in the House provision authorizing the use of \$5,000,000, as requested in the budget, of the receipts from the sale of power and energy for the purchase of power and energy and rental of transmission facilities.

TITLE III—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

PAYMENT TO THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

Appropriation, 1959-----	\$16, 850, 000
Estimate, 1960-----	15, 286, 000
House allowance-----	15, 286, 000
Committee recommendation-----	16, 286, 000

The committee agrees with the House allowance of \$15,286,000 to provide the full amount of the budget estimate for appropriations to cover acquisition of assets and expenses in the programs for navigation and flood control, for fertilizer, agricultural and munitions, and for general service activities, as well as the expenses of the watershed protection and improvement program.

The committee is advised that a request for \$8,000,000 to start construction of the Melton Hill multipurpose dam and reservoir, with navigation lock and powerhouse section, was denied by the Bureau of the Budget. The committee believes that this hydroelectric power and navigation facility should be started as soon as practicable, and since the funds for such a multipurpose facility must be provided by appropriations, the committee recommends the addition of \$1,000,000 in order to complete design and planning work and to start land acquisition. The total amount recommended is \$16,286,000.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1959 AND THE ESTIMATES FOR 1960

PERMANENT INDEFINITE APPROPRIATIONS

	Appropriation estimate, 1959	Appropriation estimate, 1960	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
Department of the Army civil functions:			
Payments to States, Flood Control Act of 1954, Army.....	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	-----
Hydraulic mining in California, debris fund.....	18,000	18,000	-----
Maintenance and operation of dams and other improvements of navigable waters.....	150,000	150,000	-----
Total, Department of Army civil functions.....	1,668,000	1,668,000	-----
Bureau of Reclamation: Disposal of Coulee Dam community.....	124,037	97,000	-\$27,037
Boulder City municipal fund.....		270,000	+270,000
Colorado River Dam fund, Boulder Canyon project:			
Payment of interest on advances from the Treasury.....	3,200,000	3,200,000	-----
Payment to States of Oregon and Nevada.....	600,000	600,000	-----
Operation, maintenance, and replacement of project works, North Platte project (Gering and Fort Laramie, Goshen and Pathfinder Irrigation Districts).....	4,000	4,000	-----
Payments to Farmers' Irrigation District (North Platte project, Nebraska-Wyoming).....	8,000	8,000	-----
Refunds and returns.....	125,000	125,000	-----
Total, Bureau of Reclamation.....	4,061,037	4,304,000	+242,963
Southwestern Power Administration: Continuing fund (emergency expenditures).....	15,000	-----	-15,000
Total, Department of the Interior.....	4,076,037	4,304,000	+227,963
Total, permanent indefinite appropriations.....	5,744,037	5,972,000	+227,963

Comparative statement of the appropriations for 1959 and the estimates for 1960—Continued

REGULAR ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS

Appropriation item	Appropriations, 1959	Budget estimates, 1960	Recommended in House bill for 1960	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—) Senate bill compared with		
					Appropriations, 1959	Budget estimates, 1960	House bill
TITLE I—CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY							
QUARTERMASTER CORPS							
Cemeterial expenses.....	\$7,450,000	\$9,000,000	\$9,194,000	\$9,194,000	+\$1,744,000	+\$194,000	-----
CORPS OF ENGINEERS							
General investigation.....	10,188,500	9,000,000	9,518,400	11,938,200	+1,749,700	+2,938,200	+\$2,419,800
Construction, general.....	608,246,500	660,000,000	658,800,100	710,034,100	+101,787,600	+50,034,100	+51,234,000
Operation and maintenance, general.....	114,521,100	113,500,000	114,382,000	122,382,000	+7,860,900	+8,882,000	+8,000,000
General expenses.....	12,738,700	12,640,000	12,640,000	12,640,000	—98,700	-----	-----
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries.....	68,347,500	68,000,000	68,560,000	75,434,500	+7,087,000	+7,434,500	+6,874,500
U.S. Section, St Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers.....	100,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	—60,000	-----	-----
Total, Corps of Engineers.....	814,142,300	863,180,000	863,940,500	932,468,800	+118,326,500	+69,288,800	+68,528,300
Total, title I, Department of the Army civil functions.....	821,592,300	872,180,000	873,134,500	941,662,800	+120,070,500	69,482,800	+68,528,300
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR							
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION							
General investigations.....	4,556,000	5,000,000	4,349,261	5,390,000	+834,000	+390,000	+1,040,739
Construction and rehabilitation.....	146,015,000	135,410,000	128,473,239	142,346,000	—3,669,000	+6,936,000	+13,872,761
Operation and maintenance.....	28,331,600	29,131,000	29,131,000	29,131,000	+799,400	-----	-----
Loan program.....	14,497,000	220,000	7,237,000	6,236,500	—8,260,500	+6,016,500	—1,000,500

General administrative expenses.....	4,381,600	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	+18,400		
Upper Colorado River Basin Fund.....	68,033,335	77,035,000	79,819,000	76,369,000	+8,335,665	-666,000	-3,450,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation.....	265,814,535	251,196,000	253,409,500	263,872,500	-1,942,035	+12,676,500	+10,463,000
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION							
Construction.....	20,934,000	25,000,000	22,332,000	22,000,000	+1,066,000	-3,000,000	-332,000
Operation and maintenance.....	9,546,200	10,250,000	10,250,000	10,250,000	+703,800		
Total, Bonneville Power Administration.....	30,480,200	35,250,000	32,582,000	32,250,000	+1,769,800	-3,000,000	-332,000
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY							
Southeastern Power Administration: Operation and maintenance.....	735,000	735,000	735,000	735,000			
Southwestern Power Administration:							
Construction.....		880,000	880,000	880,000	+880,000		
Operation and maintenance.....	1,031,250	1,150,000	1,150,000	1,150,000	+118,750		
Continuing fund.....	(4,405,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(+595,000)		
Total, Southwestern Power Administration.....	1,031,250	2,030,000	2,030,000	2,030,000	+998,750		
Total, Office of the Secretary.....	1,766,250	2,765,000	2,765,000	2,765,000	+998,750		
Total, title II, Department of the Interior.....	298,060,985	289,211,000	288,756,500	298,887,500	+826,515	+9,676,500	+10,131,000
TITLE III—INDEPENDENT OFFICES							
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	16,850,000	15,286,000	15,286,000	16,286,000	-564,000	+1,000,000	+1,000,000
Grand total.....	1,136,503,285	1,176,677,000	1,177,177,000	1,256,836,300	+298,887,500	+80,159,300	+79,659,300

¹ Includes amounts contained in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1959, and the 2d Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1959.

